SANSKRIT VIDYAPEETH BOOK SERIES-4

PĀṆINI KĀTYĀYĀNĀ AND PĀTĀNJĀLI

By
K.Madhava krishna Sarma

Preface
Dr.Karan Singh

General Editor
Dr. Mandan Mishra

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha
(Deemed University)
New Delhi

SANSKRIT VIDYAPEETH BOOK SERIES-4

PĀṆINI KĀTYĀYANA
AND
PATAÑJALI

By
K. Madhava Krishna Sarma

Preface
Dr. Karan Singh

General Editor
Dr. Mandan Mishra

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri Rashtriya
Sanakrit Vidyapeetha
(Deemed University)
New Delhi

11

Publisher :
Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri Rashtriya Sanakrit Vidyapeetha
(Deemed University)
Institutional Area,
New Delhi-110016

First Edition : 1968

Reprint Edition : 2009

ISBN : 81-87987-29-4

Price : 55/- Rs.

Printed at :
Amar Printing Press
Vijay Nagar, Delhi - 110016

TO

MY WIFE

KAMALA

FOR SHARING MY DIFFICULTIES IN LIFE

पर्यटन तथा नागर विमानन मंत्री,
MINISTER OF TOURISM & CIVIL AVIATION
NEW DELHI.

PREFACE

The Lal Bahadur Shastri Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth, which has the advancement of Indological Research as one of its objects, is happy to present to scholars of Sanskrit literature and lovers of ancient Indian wisdom this book "Panini, Katyayana and Patanjali" by K Madhava Krishna Sarma, Director of Sanskrit Education, Rajasthan. Shri Sarma is a member of the Central Sanskrit Board and also of the Sabha of the Vidyapeeth.

The importance of Panini in Sanskrit literature can hardly be over-emphasized. In the words of present author "Panini and Sanskrit are inseparable companions, the one without the other can hardly be thought of " Although some work has been done on Panini as a source of cultural history, little seems to have been done on the textual side in recent years; the difficult nature

of the subject making such an attempt not easily feasible. The present work deals with some important textual and subject problems relating to the Ashtadhyayi. Vartika of Katyayana and the Mahabhashya of Patanjali and will therefore be welcomed by scholars, particularly by those interested in this very significant branch of Sanskrit learning, as fulfilling a long-felt need.

As the work shows, Shri Sarma combines depth of traditional learning with width of modern critical scholarship, a combination which is not nearly as evident as one would wish in the field of contemporary letters. I hope this publication will revive critical interest in Panini Vyakarana, which has suffered comparative neglect of late.

Karan Singh

(Karan Singh)

General Editor's Note

Kashmir Itihas—a cultural history including the history of literary writers of Kashmir, Pañcāmṛta—a compilation of the learned writings of five notable scholars, being a comparative study of ancient Indian and modern thought, Gītakādambarī—a latest and attractive collection of select Sanskrit poems, have already been included among this year's publications in the Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth Prakashanmala. I am most happy now to include in the Series, in continuation of the above and as No. 4. Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali, well known as the Munitraya of Sanskrit Grammar. The present publication has a very great importance in the field of Pāṇini Vyākaraṇa.

The author Shri K. Madhava Krishna Sarma is one of the top most Sanskrit scholars of our day, and we are justly proud of him. As Director of Sanskrit Education, Government of Rajasthan, he has put new life and vigour into Sanskrit in the State. He will thus be remembered always as one of the most successful Educationists in the field of Sanskrit Education and one who contributed greatly towards the renaissance of Sanskrit learning in our days. It is in the fitness of things, therefore, that the Government of India have appointed him a member of the Central Sanskrit Board and, in recognition of his outstanding contributions to Indology, the Government of Rajasthan have awarded him a merit pay. This is only one aspect of his long and distiguished career as a Sanskritist. He started as a Research scholar. The late Maharaja Ganga Singhji of Bikaner, known for his disceining eye for merit, invited

him to Bikaner, at the suggestion of the late Dr. C. Kunhan Raja (then Head of the Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras), to be in charge of the Anup Sanskrit Library, and he was held in high esteem as a scholar by no less a person than the late Sardar K. M. Panikkar. The work done by him in the field of Oriental Research as Curator of the Anup Sanskrit Library and Director of Oriental Publications, Bikaner has earned the praise of Indologists all over the world.

An unusual depth of traditional learning, equalled only by his width of modern critical scholarship and a facility of English —a combination of these qualities distinguishes this eminent Vaiyākaraṇa from the rest of the contemporary Sanskrit world of letters, as is fully evidenced by the present work. Needless it is to add that a work of such a Scholar, a result of his researches extending over many years, will be welcomed by all those interested in this very important branch of Indology.

It has been my fortunate privilege to be associated with Shri Sarma for nearly two decades now in my various activities in the field of Sanskrit and to receive inspiration and affectionate guidance from him; and, if I have been able to serve the cause of Sanskrit in any way, I owe it in no small measure to this association with him. I have always looked up to him as my Guru—my Ideal—in the development of my educational career.

The publications of the Vidyapeeth are so far related only to Darśana, Sāhitya, Kāvya and Itihāsa. The publication of this work on Pāṇini Vyākaraṇa—on the great Trio of Sanskrit Grammar—adds a new dimension to our Series; and we feel proud to offer this to the world of Orientalists.

Maharajadhiraj Dr. Karan Singh of Jammu and Kashmir, in whom Rājalakṣmī, Mahālakṣmī and Sarasvatī are all combined, has been the greatest source of inspiration and encouragement to all of us in the Vidyapeeth in our various activities. Under his kind guidance, the Vidyapeeth has made steady progress. We are grateful to him for the privilege of a Preface to this work by him.

The Vidyapeeth is also highly indebted to Rashtra Kavi Dr. Ramdhari Singh 'Dinkar' for his able guidance which has helped the institution progress in many directions. As Chairman of the Shodha and Prakashan Samiti, he accepted the publication of this on the advice of M. M. Parameshwaranand Shastri, Shri Rajendra Dwivedi and Dr. Rasik Bihari Joshi. I record my sincere thanks to all of them. With these words, the work is offered to scholars.

Mandan Mishra

INTRODUCTION

Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali, presented in the following pages, was originally submitted by me to the University of Madras, as a thesis for the Degree of Master of Oriental Learning. I have made a few minor changes in it here.

Nearly two decades have passed since this was written. In the meanwhile, I have been continuously pressed by friends and scholars to publish the work for the benefit of scholars and research workers. But, pre-occupied as I was with administrative work, I could not do so till now. If the work now sees the light of day, I owe it to Dr. Mandan Mishra, Director of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth, who has taken it up for publication by the Vidyapeeth. My thanks are due to him and the other authorities of the Vidyapeeth. I am also thankful to Shri Raghuvir Chaturvedi, my colleague in the Directorate of Sanskrit Education, Rajasthan, for his repeated persuasion to me for the publication of this and for many helpful suggestions. Although a long time has elapsed since this was written, so far as I know, no further work of any importance has been done on the textual or subject side of Pāṇini in recent years. In fact, it is disconcerting to see Vyākaraṇa and other Śāstras—Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta, slowly losing their popularity, obviously because of the difficulties in studying and understanding the advanced works in these subjects. The subject which is generally selected for study in the Universities and Sanskrit Colleges and Pathashalas now is what is called Sāhitya (Classical Sanskrit Literature), and the study of Sanskrit of a modern scholar generally ends with a few poetical works, dramas, some prose and a few Alaṅkāra works. Even the Siddhāntakaumudī is dreaded for a complete study, and what is surprising is that there are already attempts to have even the

Laghusiddhāntakaumudī simplified. It is being realised less and less that none can be a good scholar even in the Alaṅkāra Śāstra unless he has a good grounding in Vyākaraṇa and Nyāya—

काणादं पाणिनीयं च सर्वशास्त्रोपकारकम् ।

And if this trend continues, I am afraid, Sanskrit will lose the depth of its traditional learning before long.

The work is mainly a textual study. The problems dealt with here include among others, the text of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, the technical terms, the Anubandhas, the authorship of the Akṣarasamāmnāya of the Dhātupāṭha, Gaṇapātha, Uṇādi Sūtra etc., the scheme of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, Kātyāyana's relation to Pāṇini as well as Patañjali's relation to Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, Kātyāyana's and Patañjali's respective approaches to Pāṇini, the correlation of the Vārtikas and the Mahābhāṣya to linguistic changes, the Pāṇinian school and the Prātiśākhyas and the Patañjalian technique of interpretation.

I have made here an attempt to prove with the correlation of linguistic changes to the Vārtikas and the Mahābhāṣya, that Kātyāyana does not comment upon Pāṇini with a view to finding fault with the latter, although his method is less organic than Patañjali's. Both Kātyāyana and Patañjali have the same object in view, namely, bridging the gulf between their respective languages and the Grammar of Pāṇini; but their methods are different from each other. I, therefore, do not agree with Goldstucker who says that "a Vārtika of Kātyāyana is therefore not a commentary which explains, but an animadversion which completes. In proposing to himself to write Vārtikas on Pāṇini, Kātyāyana did not mean to justify and defend the rules of Pāṇini, but to find fault with them and whoever has gone through his work must avow that he has done so to his heart's content."

The study of linguistic changes from one work of the Pāṇinian school to another is of absorbing interest, and, although I had originally intended to continue this to Post-Patañjalian works, I could not do so yet, for want of leisure. Similarly my intention to translate some portions of the Vākyapadīya and of

the Laghusiddhāntamañjūṣā - Nāgeśa's *magnum opus* - which are of great importance to students of Indian Philosophy, remains unfulfilled. I have, however, already published some papers on Bhartṛhari. I have pointed out (The Annals of Sri Venkateswara Oriental Institute, Vol. I, Part 3 and Poona Orientalist, Vol. V, No. 1) that he wrote a work called Śabdadhātusamīkṣā, which is now lost to us.

The importance of Bhartṛhari, a great pre-Śaṅkara Idealist, has not yet been sufficiently appreciated by our historians of Indian Philosophy. His Śabdavivartavāda has a consistent development, starting with the Vedic literature. I have given some bare outlines of this development in my paper 'Vāk before Bhartṛhari,' read at the XVI Indian Philosophical Congress and published in the Poona Orientalist, Vol. VIII, Nos. 1 & 2. Maṇḍana and Gauḍapāda have drawn their inspiration from him also. Kāśmir Śavaism owes much to him. A great champion of Intuitionism, he revived the Vedic authority and the Vedāntic Idealism, when these were challenged by the Buddhists. In the words of Ramakrishna Kavi, "The evolution of Indian Philosophy shall lose an important link if study and appreciation of Vākyapadīya is ignored."

When the work was going through the Press, I fell seriously ill, and could not devote as much attention to the correction of proofs as I should have; and, if, consequently, some misprints have crept in, I crave the indulgence of readers. I received much help in correcting the proofs and seeing the work expeditiously through the Press from my colleague Shri Suraj Narain Sharma, who also typed the press copy. I record here my sincere thanks to him.

I shall be failing in my duty if I do not gratefully remember here Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, who introduced me to Indo-European Philology and researches in Pāṇini, and the late Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, under whom I worked for many years. I am also thankful to the Ajanta Printers, Jaipur, for their co-operation in the expeditious printing of the Book.

I am highly thankful to Dr. Karan Singh, Minister of Tourism and Civil Aviation, Government of India, and the Sabhapati of Shri

Lal Bahadur Shastri Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth, for kindly contributing a Preface to this work.

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to Shri Mohanlal Sukhadia, Chief Minister of Rajasthan, for his sustained interest in, and love for, Sanskrit, which have been a source of encouragement to me and which have enabled me to contribute my mite to the progress of Sanskrit Education in Rajasthan.

It is hoped that Pāṇini will receive more and more attention with the development of Linguistics. No finality is claimed for the views expressed here. Research is a continuous process. I present the work with the words of the great Varāhamihira :

यद्वा मया कुकृतमल्पमिहाकृतं वा
कार्यं तदत्र विदुषा परिहृत्य रागम् ।

JAIPUR,
29-3-1968.

K. Madhava Krishna Sarma

CONTENTS

PANINI

CHAPTER I

The work of Pāṇini is the first extant book on grammar on any language, treated in a scientific way. From the time it was written, a few centuries before the Christian era, it has held its position till this very day, and it has been the object of admiration even of modern students of grammar. There were grammarians before him; he cites them in his own work. Independent works on Sanskrit grammar have been written after him; but Pāṇini's work yet remains the Sanskrit grammar. The Pāṇinian system in Sanskrit grammar was absolute throughout the ages, and it is not surprising that Bhāmaha should hail it in the following terms :

सालातुरीयमतमेतदनुक्रमेण[1]
को वक्ष्यतीति विरतोऽहमतो विचारात् ।
शब्दार्णवस्य यदि कश्चिदुपैति पारं
भीमाम्भसश्च जलधेरिति विस्मयोऽसौ ॥

The text of the Aṣṭādhyāyī

The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini, as that term indicates, is a work in eight chapters, each of which has been further divided into four Pādas. The number of Sūtras in each Pāda according to the Kāśikāvṛtti, is as follows :

Chapter	1.	75, 73, 93, 110.
,,	2.	72, 38, 73, 85.
,,	3.	150, 188, 176, 117.
,,	4.	178, 145, 168, 144.
,,	5.	136, 140, 119, 160.
,,	6.	223, 199, 139, 175.
,,	7.	103, 118, 120, 97.
,,	8.	74, 108, 119, 68.
	Total	3,983

1. Kāvyālaṅkāra, 6.62.

The Nirnayasagara edition too contains 3, 983; but the Balamanorma edition has only 3981, the difference being seen in the first Pāda of the fourth chapter; while the Kāśikā and the Nirnayasagara editions have 178 Sūtras in the first Pāda of the fourth chapter, the Balamanorama edition has only 176; the latter has, following Kaiyaṭa's[2] remarks on them, taken Sūtras वृद्धस्य च पूजायाम् (4.1.166) and यूनश्च कुत्सायाम् (4.1.167) as Vārtikas. The Panini Office edition follows the Nirnayasagara edition in all cases. In his edition which contains the same number of Sūtras as the Nirnayasagara, Basu has not failed to take note of Kaiyaṭa's remarks on Pāṇini 4.1.166 and 167. Some other editions and a good number of manuscripts which I have consulted, also agree in this respect with the Kāśikāvṛtti. Vaidya[3] and Haraprasada[4] Sastri give the same number as found in the Kāśikā. Goldstucker[5] thinks that it is 3,996 and three or four of them did not originally belong to the Aṣṭādhyāyī. Monier[6] Williams also gives the same number. According to Thumb,[7] the number is 3,976. The number given by Taranatha[8] Tarkavacaspati is 3,965.

In my search for ancient authorities on this subject, I have come across only the following verses and indices.

(1) [9]चतुःसहस्री सूत्राणां पञ्चसूत्रविवर्जिता ।
अष्टाध्यायी पाणिनीया सूत्रैर्माहेश्वरैः सह ॥

Thus the number is 3,995, along with the 14 Akṣarasamāmnāya Sūtras, i. e., 3,981 for the Aṣṭādhyāyī alone.

(2) [10]त्रीणि सूत्रसहस्राणि तथा नवशतानि च ।
षण्णवतिं च सूत्राणां पाणिनिः कृतवान्स्वयम् ॥

---

2. सूत्रेषु तु कैश्चित् वृद्धस्य च पूजायामिति वार्तिकदर्शनात् प्रक्षिप्तम् (4.1.163) यूनश्च कुत्सायामिति सूत्रमनार्षमिति वचनम् (4.1.162)
3. History of Sanskrit Literature, Section III, pp. 122ff.
4. A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss., A. S. B., Preface to Vol. VI, p. 17.
5. Literary Remains, Vol. I. p. 127; Pāṇini, p. 121.
6. Indian Wisdom, p. 163.
7. Handbuch des Sanskrit, Einleitung, p 29.
8. See the Siddhānta Kaumudī, Introduction, p. 8 (Calcutta, 1870)
9. Svarasiddhāntacandrikā, p. 3, verse 15, Annamalai University edition.
10. Vide S. C. Chakravarti's Introduction to his edition of the Nyāsa.

Thus the number here is 3,996 or one more than what is given above.

There are some ancient[11] indices fort he Aṣṭādhyāyī beginning with वृद्धिराद्यन्तवदव्ययीभावः प्रत्ययस्य लुक् पञ्चदश. They are a kind of formulae serving as easy means to memorise the Sūtras as well as to preserve the text free from corruption. Here the beginning of the first and every 20th following Sūtra is given. They were invented probably by Vaidikas who had to study the Aṣṭādhyāyī and who were familiar with similar ones occurring for Vedic[12] works. They are found in some old Mss.[13] of the Adyar Library. These indices do not reckon वृद्धस्य च पूजायाम् (4-1-166) and यूनश्च कुत्सायाम् (4-1-167) as Sūtras. The number according to these is therefore 3,981, the same as that given in the Svarasiddhānta-candrikā. The Balamanorama edition is evidently based on these.

Except these verses and indices which evidently follow Kāśikā more or less, there does not seem to be any other express ancient authority to help us in deciding the exact number of Sūtras that should have originally belonged to the Aṣṭādhyāyī; and the only safe course thus open to us in the present state of our knowledge is to accept the text as found in the Kāśikāvṛtti, which is the most ancient complete commentary, with such alterations as are warranted by internal evidences or by evidences from Kātyāyana and Patañjali and the later commentators.

After collecting all the evidence furnished by the Munitraya (Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali) and considering all the commentatorial statements thereon, Kielhorn[14] comes to the conclusion that "the text given in the Kāśikāvṛtti (and that of the

---

11. Printed in the Balamanorama edition of the Aṣṭādhyāyī and in the Aṣṭādhyāyī appended to the Venkatesvara Press edition of the Sidhāntakaumudī.

12. Cf. those occurring at the end of each section of the Taittirīya Saṃhitā, Brāhmaṇa, Āraṇyaka, etc.

13. IX D. 10, IX. D. 60, etc.

14. Indian Antiquary, Vol. 16, p. 184; see also Der Grammatiker Pāṇini by the same author. I do not find any necessity to detail here all the commentatorial statements which have already been collected by Kielhorn. I may, however,

Aṣṭādhyāyī in the editions) contains (as shown below) 20 more Sūtras than the original text."

P. 1.1.17 and 18 originally formed the one rule उञ ऊँ

P. 1.4.58 and 59 „ „ „ प्रादय-उपसर्गाः क्रियायोगे ।

P. 2.1.11 and 12 „ „ „ विभाषा अपपरिबहिरञ्चवः पञ्चम्या ।

P. 4.3.117 and 118 „ „ „ संज्ञायां कुलालादिभ्यो वुञ् ।

P. 5.1.57 and 58 originally formed the one rule तदस्य परिमाणं संख्यायाः संज्ञासङ्घसूत्राध्ययनेषु ।

P. 6.1.32 and 33 originally ह्वः संप्रसारणमभ्यस्तस्य च ।

P. 6.1.164 and 165 originally तद्धितस्य कितः ।

P. 6.3.117—119 originally इदुद्भ्यामौदच्च घेः ॥

Whole rules added to the text

P. 4.1.166, 167; 4.2.8; 4.3.132, 133; 5.1.36; 6.1.62; 6.1.100; 6.1.136; 6.1.156.

Pāṇini 6.1.137 and 138 which originally formed the one rule

संपरिभ्यां भूषणसमवाययोः करोतौ ;

have been altered in addition to being split up into two :

संपर्युपेभ्यः करोतौ भूषणे; समवाये च ।

Thieme[15] in his Pāṇini and the Veda points out that P.6.1.117 and 118 originally formed the one rule यजुष्युर आपो जुषाणो वृष्णो

---

state that before reading Kielhorn's article in the Indian Antiquary, I collected the evidences myself on the same lines as he has done and arrived at the same result except that I got one more Sūtra which, as will be presently shown, is in all probability a later interpolation.

15. Pp. 53-55 यजुष्युरः is the reading adopted generally by all commentaries, but Kāśikā draws attention to the variant यजुष्युरो. Thieme says : "Pāṇini can only have had in view the invocation उरो अन्तरिक्ष in the Yajus T. S. 1.3.8.1., M. S. 1.2.15, 3.9.7, K. S. 2 2, 3.6 उरोऽन्तरिक्ष सजूर्देवेन वातेन. Where the qnestion is not of उरः 'Chest' but of the sing-voc. of उरु 'broad'. Pāṇini must have said यजुष्युरः with Sandhi before the आ of आपः For there is no reason why 6.1.117 should be separated from 6.1.118, the words mentioned in this whole passage being with regard to the elision, all of exactly the same order. The splitting up of this originally one rule into two, can easily be comprehended as an attempt to settle the pausa—form·········"t

वषिष्ठेऽम्बेऽम्बालेऽम्बिके पूर्वे । The number of the additional Sūtras contained in the text followed by Kāśikā would thus be 21. To this I have to add one more, namely, प्रहासे च मन्योपपदे मन्यतेरुत्तम एकवच्च (P. 1.4.106), which I regard as a probable interpolation for the following reasons.

1. The meaning of this Sūtra is this :

"When[16] joke is implied with reference to an action, the verb denoting it is used in the second person; provided that the word manya to think is the attendant word (Upapada) of such verb, and of the verb manya itself the affix must be of the first person and singular number." If this Sūtra is of Pāṇini's making, there is no need for him to repeat the word उत्तम in the next one (अस्मद्य त्तम:), as this word can be easily taken over to that by Anuvṛtti. To those who are well acquainted with the studied economy of words which Pāṇini observes throughout his work, the wording of the next rule sounds rather strange. When the word उत्तम is contained in this, Pāṇini ught to have only अस्मदि च as the next rule.

2. If Pāṇini has an aphorism here like this, it is ununderstandable why he should again put the root in the first person in 8. 1. 46[17] (एहि मन्ये प्रहासे लृट्), which, in Pāṇinian phraseology, amounts to a special and significant effort on his part; for such use of manya is already confined to occasions implying joke by P. 1. 4. 106. This has been noted by Kāiśkā which on P. 8. 1. 46 has the remark :

एहि मन्य इत्युत्तमोपादानमतन्त्रम् ।
प्रहास एव हि मन्यतेरुत्तमो विहितस्ततोऽन्यत्र मध्यम एव भवति ॥

The usual way in which Patañjali treats these words which seem to be superfluous is either to discard them or to justify their use by Pāṇini.

3. Both Kātyāyana and Patañjali are silent over this Sūtra. There are many Vārtikas on P. 1.1.105, 107 and 108; Patañjali also comments on them at great length; but there is not a word said on this by either.

---

16. Vasu.
17. "In connection with ehi manya used derisively, the first Future that follows, retain its accent." Vasu.

4. The counter-instance एहि मन्ये रथेन यास्यसि which Patañjali gives for P. 8.1.46 is identical in form with the instance of that rule and this fact shows[18] that, according to him, joke is implied here not by the person of thc verb, but by its accent. All the later works except the Prakriyā-kaumudī[19] which in this respect follows the Mahābhāṣya, give एहि मन्यसे ओदनं भोक्ष्ये इति as a counter-instance. If Patañjali knows that there is a Sūtra like प्रहासे च मन्योपपदे मन्यतेरुत्तम एकवच्च, he ought to give एहि मन्यसे रथेन यास्यसि and not एहि मन्ये रथेन यास्यसि as a counter-instance for P. 8.1.46. Nor does the Mahābhāṣyakāra question the necessity of putting the root in the first person in this Sūtra.

It is thus clear that this Sūtra is not known to Kātyāyana and Patañjali; but it has already been introduced into the text in the time of the Kāiśkāvṛtti. Taking this as an interpolation, the text of the Aṣṭādhyāyī followed by Kāśikā would contain 22 additional Sūtras. In this connection, one more Sūtra, namely (P. 3.2.30) नाडीमुष्ट्योश्च deserves examination. Böhtlingk[20] regards this rule as not belonging to the original text of Pāṇini. That his view is untenable may be seen from an examination of the two Vārtikas on नासिकास्तनयोर्ध्माधेटोः (P. 3.2.29), namely, स्तने धेटः and मुष्टौ ध्मश्च. The object[21] of the first Vārtika is to bring in the operation of the rule यथासंख्यमनुदेशः समानाम् (P. 1.3.10) in order to add 'dhama' and 'dhaya' to 'nāsikā' and 'stana' respectively. Kātyāyana does not have the word nāsikandhaya. The second Vārtika which is a supplement to P. 3.2.30 says that the operation of that rule (3.2.30) in respect of the word 'muṣṭi' is not regulated by P. 1.3.10 and that we can have both muṣṭindhaya and muṣṭindhama. It is very doubtful whether Pāṇini who is silent over the non-regulation of the operation of the rule नाडीमुष्ट्योश्च by P. 1.3.10 knows the word muṣṭindhama. If Kātyāyana does not have a Sūtra like नाडीमुष्ट्योश्च, the remark मुष्टौ ध्मश्च cannot emanate from him. The use of dhama and dhaya comes to be liberalised to a great extent in the days of Patañjali who says :

---

18. See Kaiyaṭa's explanation of this which is not at all convincing.
19. It may be noted that this work does not comment upon P. 1.4.106
20. See his note on this Sūtra in his edition of Pāṇini. His reasons are not clear.
21. See the Siddhāntakaumudī and the Prauḍhamanoramā on these Vārtikas.

अत्यल्पमिदमुच्यते । नासिकानाडीमुष्टिघटीखारीष्विति वक्तव्यम् ।
नासिकन्धमः नासिकन्धयः ।

Böhtlingk has perhaps overlooked the fact that this Sūtra (नाडीमुष्ट्योश्च) has been quoted[22] by Kātyāyana and Patañjali in the course of their comments on Pāṇini 1.3.10. There is also the evidence of Bhaṭṭi, the poet grammarian, who in the following verse gives nāḍindhama after giving instances for[23] P. 3.2.28 and 29.

सत्वमेजय सिंहाढ्यान् स्तनन्धयसमत्विषौ ।
कथं नाडिन्धमान् मार्गानागतौ विषमोपलान् ॥ (6.94)

It has therefore to be noted that except the twenty-one cases cited by Kielhorn and the one additional noted by me, there is no rule which can reasonably be supposed to be an interpolation.

The number of Sūtras on which Kātyāyana has written Vārtikas :

The number of Sūtras on which Kātyāyana has written Vārtikas is[24] 1,245. Kielhorn [25] says : "······1,713 are actually treated of by Kātyāyana and Patañjali, nearly 600 rules are fully and about 350 other rules partly quoted in the Mahābhāṣya,"

I have independenty counted the Sūtras which have been either commented upon or in anyway presupposed by Kātyāyana and Patañjali, and have arrived at the following :

Chapter	1.	75,	63,	62,	84.
,,	2.	60,	33,	59.	75.
,,	3.	118,	109,	90,	75.
,,	4.	146,	97,	108,	52.
,.	5.	87,	84,	80,	64.
,,	6.	166,	83,	98,	142.
,,	7.	86,	88,	91,	65.
,,	8.	53,	85,	84,	50.
		Total	2,715		

22. Kātyāyana : ध्माधेटोर्नाडीमुष्ट्योश्च ।
Patañjali : ध्माधेटोर्नाडीमुष्ट्योश्च संख्यातानुदेशो न प्राप्नोति ।
23. See Jayamaṅgalā also
24 See Macdonell, A History of Sanskrit Literature, P. 431; also A Sanskrit Grammar for Beginners, Introduction, P. 11; Goldstucker, Pāṇini; P. 121.
25. Indian Antiquary, Vol. 16, P. 184.

Sūtras on which there are no Vārtikas, but which have, however, been commented upon by Patañjali : The Mahābhāṣya not a commentary on the Vārtikas alone :

Apart from these Sūtras on which Kātyāyana has written Vārtikas, there are about 400 others commented upon by Patañjali, but on which there are no comments by Kātyāyana. This leads on to the conclusion that the Mahābhāṣya is not a commentary on the Vārtikas, but on the Sūtras along with the Vārtikas, and that Patñajali's object in writing it is the same as that which Kātyāyana had in writing the Vārtikas, namely, to enable Pāṇini's grammar to keep pace with the growing language. That this great commentator concerns himself not merely with the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana, can be seen also from instances like the following in which he evidently criticises some other grammarian than Kātyāyana in the same strain as he usually does the latter (Kātyāyana)

ऊर्यादिच्विडाश्च (P. 1.4.61) Patajñali :

कृम्वस्तियोग इति वक्तव्यम् । इहैव यथा स्यात् । ऊरीकृत्य । ऊरीभूय । इह माभूत् । ऊरीपक्त्वा । तर्त्तहि वक्तव्यम् । न वक्तव्यम् । क्रियायोग इत्यनुवर्तते । न चान्या क्रिययोर्यादिच्विडाचां योगोऽस्ति ॥

आङ् मर्यादावचने (P. 1-4-89)

आङ् मर्यादाभिविध्योरिति वक्तव्यम् । इहापि यथा स्यात् । आकुमारं यशः पणिनेरिति । तर्त्तहि वक्तव्यम् । न वक्तव्यम् । मर्यादावचन इत्येव सिद्धम् । एषास्य यशसो मर्यादा ॥[26]

Taranatha Tarkavacaspati rightly observes -

"वार्तिके तु अष्टाध्यायीसूत्रानुपदिष्टाधिकांशपरिपूरणेन सूत्रतात्पर्य व्याख्यानम्···· । महाभाष्ये सूत्रवार्तिकव्याख्यानपूर्वकं शब्दशक्तिनिरूपणेन युक्तिप्रदर्शनम् ॥[27]

In the beginning of his commentary, Patañjali. by way of introducing us to his texts, Says :

कथं पुनरिदं भगवतः पणिनेराचार्यस्य लक्षणं प्रवृत्तम् ?

We cannot, therefore, subscribe to the view that the Mahābhāṣya is only[28] a commentary on the Vārtikas. Patañjali's object

26. There are many others of this kind to illustrate the point.
27. Introductiou to the Siddhāntakaumudī, P 8 (Calcutta, 1870).
28. Ramchandra Ghosha, Peep into the Vaidik Age, P. 148.

therefore being[29] "like that of Kātyāyana, merely a critical one" he comments only on such Sūtras as are in need of re-examination by him.

Examination of Skold's view regarding the Sūtras unexplained by Patañjali

Hannes Skold's sweeping remark that "where[30] a Sūtra is not expressly stated and explained in the Mahābhāṣya we have enough reason to suppose that it did not exist in the original text itself, nor the Sūtra dependent on it." etc., cannot thus stand to reason. He seems to have taken it for granted that the Mahābhāṣya is a word-for-word commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī. It has already been pointed out that there is no need for Patañjali to explain all the Sūtras. For instance, a critical commentary like the Laghuśabdendu-śekhara or the Prauḍhamanoramā does not explain every sentence of the text, but only such as are in need of an explanation. The need for a commentary on a grammatical work is usually created by the further evolution of the language with which it is concerned, and the object of such a commentary should naturally be three-fold, namely, to emend, to supplement and to explain the text wherever it is necessary to do so. By approaching the Mahābhāṣya in a critical and historical way, it would be clear why Kātyāyana and Patañjali have not touched upon a vast number ot Sūtras. When we speak of the Mahābhāṣya as a commentary on the Sūtras and Vārtikas, the word must be taken in its widest sense, i. e., to mean a critical study of both Pāṇini and Kātyāyana. Nageśa says :

व्याख्यातृत्वेऽप्यस्येष्ट्यादिकथनेनान्याख्यातृत्वादितरभाष्यवैलक्षण्येन महत्त्वम् ॥[31]

Further, it should be noted here that Pāṇini has been held in high reverence in all the departments of Sanskrit literature throughout the ages. According to a tradition, the revered Ṛṣi is an incarnation of God Śiva. The following terms in which Patañjali refers to him are proof positive and conclusive of not only the esteem in which the great grammarian is held in his (Patañjali's)

---

29. Goldstucker, Pāṇini, P.121
30. Papers on Pāṇini, P. 23
31. Udyota, p. 5,

days but also of the amount of sanctity that is attached to the Aṣṭādhyāyī as a Vedāṅga text.

> प्रमाणभूत आचार्यो दर्भपवित्रपाणिः शुचावकाशे प्राङ् मुख उपविश्य
> महता यत्नेन सूत्रं प्रणयति स्म ।
> तत्राशक्यं वर्णेनाप्यनर्थकेन भवितुं किं पुनरियता सूत्रेण ॥

To deliberately tamper to a great extent with the text of so sacred a work as this would have been considered a sin and Sanskrit tradition could not have failed to remember the name of the miscreant. The general practice with the commentators is to introduce some new Nyāyas and Paribhāṣās or rules [32] of interpretation and squeeze the desired meaning out of the Sūtras than alter a letter thereof, although in many places, the commentators have expressed dissatisfaction with the wording of the Sūtras. To say that more than half the present number of Sūtras do not belong to the original work is also to ignore the entire Indian tradition, through the centuries, of preserving the Vedas and Vedāṅgas without deliberate tampering. The Aṣṭādhyāyī, might, even as Vedic works, have undergone a few changes pointed out above which are results of accidents and mistakes and which are inevitable in any work of that antiquity; but it really passes one's comprehension how Pāṇini's text could have passed through such tremendous vicissitudes as Skold would suppose ! Further, some rules not commented by on Patañjali are very elementary and absolutely needed for any grammar and it is therefore absurd to say that they did not form part of Pāṇini's grammar.

Nor can the contention that Candragomin redacted the text of the Aṣṭādhyāyī or of the Mahābhāṣya be tenable; for we know that this grammarian has written a separate[33] work to account for the ungrammatical words found in the Buddhist literature and that there was no need for him to emend the Aṣṭādhyāyī or the

---

32. For instance, instead of employing va consisting of only one syllable, Pāṇini employs anyatarasyām in a number of Sūtras; to justify this the latter commentators have the Paribhāṣā; पर्यायशब्दानां लाघवगौरवचर्चा नाद्रियते ।
(115) See also Paribhāṣā; 122, 124, etc., in the Paribhāṣenduśekhara.

33. See Belvalkar, Systems of Sanskrit Grammār. P. 35; Kielhorn, Ind, Ant. Vol. 15, p. 182; Liebich, Pāṇini.

Mahābhāṣya for that purpose. Skold has overlooked the important fact that out of the 213 rules relating only to the Vedic language, the following are 'Bhāṣye na vyākhyātas. No Buddhist could have possibly taken so much interest in Vedic studies as to rush to introduce new rules into the Aṣṭādhyāyī to account for the Vedic words. The rules referred to above are : P. 1-2-36, 2-4-28, 3-1-42. 3-1-50, 3-1-59, 3-2-27, 3-2-63, 3-2-88, 3-2-137, 3-2-170, 3-3-34, 3-3-129, 4-1-29, 4-1-46, 4-1-59, 4-3-19, 4-3-71, 4-3-150, 5-1-61, 5-1-67, 6-1-91, 5-2-89, 5-3-13, 5-3-26, 5-3-33, 5-3-59, 5-3-111, 5-4-12, 5-4-123, 5-4-142, 6-1-34, 6-1-52, 6-1-133, 6-1-178, 6-2-164, 6-3-96, 6-3-108, 6-3-126, 6-4-5, 6-4-99, 6-4-102, 7-1-38, 7-1-83, 7-2-31, 7-3-97, 7-4-8, 7-4-44, 8-1-64, 8-2-61, 8-3-119.

Skold[34] further says that the Aṣṭādhyāyī originally ended with नोदात्तस्वरितोदयम्, that the rest of this Sūtra namely, अगार्ग्यकाश्यपगालवानाम् and the whole of the next, viz., अ अ इति are "latter embroideries" and that the introductory portion of the Mahābhāṣya in which the rule अ अ इति is said to finish the Aṣṭādhyāyī and which is thus an evidence against his conclusion does not form part of the original text of the Mahābhāṣya !

There is indisputable evidence to show that the Aṣṭādhyāyī did originally end with the rule अ अ इति। Firstly, there is the following discussion of this Sūtra in which Kātyāyana, the Ślokavārtika and Patañjali all participate and which Skold has no reason to set aside as a later embroidery.

अ अ इति

Patañjali : किमर्थमिदमुच्यते । अकारो ऽक्षरसमाम्नाये
विवृत उपदिष्टस्तस्य संवृततापत्यापत्तिः क्रियते ।
किं पुनः कारणं विवृत उपदिश्यते ।

Ślokavārtika :

आदेशार्थं सवर्णार्थमकारो विवृतः स्मृतः ।
आकारस्य यथा ह्रस्वस्तदर्थं पाणिनेर अ ॥

Patañjali :

आदेशार्थं तावत् वृक्षाभ्याम्, देवदत्त ३ ।
....

34. Ibid, pp. 7-8.

Kātyāyana :

अकारस्य प्रत्यापत्तौ दीर्घप्रतिषेधः...... ...35

....

Secondly, there is the Vārtika

एकशेषनिर्देशाद्वा स्वरभिन्नानां भगवतः पाणिनेः सिद्धम्,

which most respectfully mentions the name of the great grammarian and ends with[35] the very auspicious word 'siddha' with which this work begins (Cf. सिद्धे शब्दार्थसंबन्धे....), both these facts showing that the Aṣṭādhyāyī ends only here and that this is the last Vārtika on it. Adding with all reverence the honorific term Ācārya which he always uses in referring to Pāṇini, Patañjali associates himself saying : एकशेषनिर्देशाद्वा स्वरभिन्नानां भगवतः पाणिनेराचार्यस्य सिद्धम् । एकशेषनिर्देशोऽयम् । अ अ इति ।

The view that the Paspaśā does not form part of the original text of the Mahābhāṣya has also to be rejected in the same way on the evidence of the Vārtika सिद्धे शब्दार्थसम्बन्धे etc and Patañjali's commentary on it. Lastly, there is the evidence left by Pāṇini himself, namely, the 'iti' which he adds to this rule (8. 4. 68) and which shows the finish of the work. 'अ अ इति' and not 'अ अ' is the reading known to Patañjali,[37] Kāśikā,[38] Puruṣottamadeva[39] and Kaiyaṭa.[40] This reading is supported also by the two old Mss. of the Adyar Library bearing the shelf numbers IX, D.60 and IX.D 10. Kielhorn[41] who has examind a good number of old Mss. of the Aṣṭādhyāyī and compared the variant readings presented by them, accepts it. In the Benares edition of the Mahābhāṣya this rule is wrongly printed as अ अ ॥ ६८ ॥ इति ॥

---

35. See the Mahābhāṣya for the full discussion.
36. Kātyāyana usually puts this words in the beginning of a Vārtika, e.g., सिद्धन्तु तपरनिर्देशात्; but here he uses it at the end of the Vārtika with a view to finishing his work with the benedictory word.
37. See how Patañjali quotes this rule with 'iti' in his commentary on it.
38. See the reading in the Kāśikāvṛtti
39. See Puruṣottamadeva
40. See Pradīpa. Kaiyaṭa gives this as, अ अ इति । He does not usually add इति to Sūtras. Cf. other instances.
41. See Kielhorn, Der Grammatiker Pāṇini; Böhtlingk, Grammatik, p. 479, Word Index to Pāṇinisūtrapāṭha G.O.S. class C. No. 2. footnote, P. 648.

Skold seems to have been misguided by Kāśikā's statement that the word udaya in P. 8.4.67 is used to express benediction.

उदात्तपरस्येति वक्तव्यम्, उदयग्रहणं मङ्गलार्थम् ।
अनेकाचार्यसंकीर्तनं पूजार्थम् ॥

Kāsikā thinks that it is quite enough for the purpose if the word is employed near the end; it need not neeessarily stand exactly at the end of the work. The following instances also show that in such non-technical matters as Maṅgala, the words आदि, मध्य and अन्त्य are used rather loosely by Śāstrakāras. Cf :

शिवशमरिष्टस्यकरे (4.4.143)

Padamañjarī :

मध्ये शिवशब्दः शिवशमरिष्टस्य कर इति ।[42]

भूवादयो धातवः (P. 1.3.1.)

Patañjalī :

भूवादीनां वकारोऽयं मङ्गलार्थः प्रयुज्यते ।
मङ्गलादीनि मङ्गलमध्यानि मङ्गलान्तानि
हि शास्त्राणि प्रथन्ते ॥

It may be noted that neither of these two is exactly in the middle of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. In fact a glance at the terminology of ancient phoneticians preserved in the Prātiśākhyas would convince us that the use of उदय here by Pāṇini is not, as Kāśikā would have it, preferential and intended for the purpose described above. Udaya performed the office of Pāṇini's 'para' in the work of pre-Pāṇinian grammarians and as a grammatical term meaning that which follows, it is perhaps older than the latter. The Ṛk-Prātiśākhya which is in all probability pre-Pāṇinian, shows a particular predilection for this term.

Cf.	इकारोदय एकारमकारः सोदयः	(2·6)
	उकारोदय आकारम्	(2.7)
	स्वामकण्ठ्यं स्वरोदयम्	(2.8)
	न क्षैप्राः प्राकृतोदयः	(2.8)
	दीर्घपूर्वः स्वरोदयः	(2.9)
	ऋकार उदये	(2.18)

42. See Padamañjarī on p. 8.4.67.

सर्वैरेवोदयाः परे	(2.16)
इति नोदयेषु	(2.25)
सहोदया········	(2.27)
उदये सचेति········	(2.30)
स्वरोदयम्	(2.36)

It would thus be clear that Pāṇini uses it as a most popular term in his days, not intending it to convey anything more than its ordinary technical meaning. The absence of any reference to the contrary opinion of Gārgya, etc. in the Atharva[43] Prātisākhya cannot be taken as an evidence for the omission of these names in this Sūtra by Pāṇini. The Prātisākhyas are all confined to their respective Śākhās and it is not always that they refer to schools which differ from them; but the case with Pāṇini's grammar is quite different; this is common to all Śākhās and has to take into consideration the views held also in other schools of grammar.

It is really surprising that Skold who elsewhere says that "Where a Sūtra is not expressly stated and explained in the Mahābhāṣya, we have enough reason to suppose that it did not exist in the original text", etc., forgets here the fact that the rule नोदात्तस्वरितोदयमगार्ग्यकाश्यपगालवानाम् is a 'Bhāsye na vyākhyāta', and that according to him, it did not exist in the original text'. Where is then the possibility of the original text ending with नोदात्तस्वरितोदयम् ।

We have, therefore, to conclude that except those few changes which have crept in and which have been pointed out above, the text of the Aṣṭādhyāyī has been preserved without any corruption,[44] just as that of the Ṛgveda where, too, variant readings have crept in.

---

43. See A. P. 3,70
4. Vide Max Muller, Preface to the Rgveda, Vol. 4, P. 14.

CHAPTER II

Technical terms in the Aṣṭādhyāyī

The next problem that should deserve our attention here is the one concerning the technical terms in the Aṣṭādhvāyī. Pāṇini makes use of nearly 100 technical terms, some having been invented by him and others (probably a larger number) adopted from ancient works. The following have been defined by him:—

(1) वृद्धि: 1.1.1; (2) गुण: 1.1.2; (3) संयोग: 1.1.7; (4) अनुनासिक: 1.1.8; (5) सवर्णम् 1.1.9; (6) प्रगृह्यम् 1.1.11; (7) घु 1.1.20; (8) घ 1.1.22; (9) संख्या 1.1.23; (10) षट् 1.1.24; (11) निष्ठा 1.1.26; (12) सर्वनाम 1.1.27; (13) अव्ययम् 1.1.37; (14) सर्वनामस्थानम् 1.1.42; (15) संप्रसारणम् 1.1.45; (16) लोप: 1.1.60; (17--19) लुक्श्लुलुप् 1.1.61; (20) उपधा 1.1.65; (21) वृद्धम् 1.1.73; (22–24) ह्रस्व: दीर्घ: प्लुतः 1.2.27; (25) उदात्त: 1.2.28 (26) अनुदात्त: 1.2.29; (27) स्वरितः 1.2.30; (28) अपृक्तम् 1.2.41; (29) कर्मधारय: 1.2.42; (30) उपसर्जनम् 1.2.43 f.; (31) प्रातिपदिकम् 1.2.45 f.; (32) एकशेष: 1.2.64; (33) इत् 1.3.2; (34) नदी 1.4.3ff; (35) घि 1.4.7ff.; (36) लघु 1.4.10; (37) गुरु 1.4.11f; (38) अङ्गम् 1.4.13; (39) पदम् 1.4.14ff; (40) भम् 1.4.18ff; (41) बहुवचनम् 1.4.21; (42-43) द्विवचनम्, एकवचनम् 1.4.22; (44) अपादानम् 1.4.24ff; (45) संप्रदानम् 1.4.32ff ; (46) करणम् 1.4.42; (47) अधिकरणम् 1.4.45; (48) कर्म 1.4.49ff; (49) कर्ता 1.4.54; (50) निपात: 1.4.56ff; (51) उपसर्ग: 1.4.59; (52) गति: 1.4.60ff; (53) कर्मप्रवचनीय: 1.4.83ff; (54) परस्मैपदम् 1.4.99; (55) आत्मनेपदम् 1.4.100; (56-58) प्रथम:, मध्यम:, उत्तम: 1.1.101; (59) विभक्ति: 1.4.104; (60) संहिता 1.4.109; (61) अवसानम् 1.4.104; (62) द्विगु: 2.1.52; (63) बहुव्रीहि: 2.2.23; (64) द्वन्द्व: 2.2.29; (65) आमन्त्रितम् 2.3.48; (66) सम्बुद्धि: 2.3.49; (67) उपपदम् 3.1.92; (68) कृत्या: 3.1.95; (69) लुङ् 3.1.110ff; (70) लङ् 3.2.111ff; (71) लृट् 3.2.112ff; (72) लिट् 3.2.115ff; (73) लट् 3,2.123ff; (74) लुट् 3.3.15ff; (75) लृङ् 3.3.139ff; (76) लिङ् 3,3.161ff; (77) लोट् 3.3.162ff; (78) लेट् 3.4.7ff; (79) सार्वधातुकम्

3.4.113; (80) आर्धधातुकम् 3.4.114; (81) गोत्रम् 4.1.162; (82) युवा 4.1.163ff; (83) तद्राज: 4.1.172; (84) आम्रेडितम् 8.1.2.

The meagreness of evidence renders it impossible to have a clear-cut division of the Saṃjñās into Pāṇinian and non-Pāṇinian, and the authorship of many of them can be decided only by a good deal of further investigation. What is attempted here is only to examine the conclusion arrived at by Goldstucker regarding them and to give certain broad characteristics of Pāṇinian terms which may help future attempts to distinguish them from the rest.

Goldstucker's conclusions

Goldstuker[45] thinks that a solution to the above problem is contained in the rules तदशिष्यं संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात् (P. 1. 2. 53). According to him, this rule tells us what we should understand by the term 'Saṃjñā in Pāṇini's grammar and thus help us to mark Pāṇinian terms off from others. He interprets it as follows:--

"Amongst these rules, one (1.2.53) referring to a subject touched on by him in a previous Sūtra, says: "Such matter will not be taught by me, for it falls under the category of conventional terms, which are settled (and therefore do not require any rule of mine; literally: for it has the authority of a saṃjñā or conventional term)" To these words, Patañjali appends the following gloss: "when Pāṇini speaks of conventional terms which he will not teach, because they are settled, does he mean by this expression, such technical terms as ṭi, ghu, bha, and the like ? No, for saṃjñā is here the same as saṃjñāna 'understanding' (i. e., a name which has a real meaning, that may be traced etymologically)". And Kaiyaṭa enlarges upon these words in the following strain:

"The question of Patañjali is suggested by the rule of analogy. His answer is in the negative, because context itself has a greater weight than (mere) analogy." Now, though such terms as ṭi, ghu, bha, and the like, are settled terms, this circumstance would not have been a sufficient reason in an etymological work (like that of Pāṇini) for leaving them untaught, for they have no etymology. 'Understanding, (as Patāñjali paraphrases Saṃjñā) means mentally

45. Pāṇini, p. 163ff.

entering into, understanding the component parts of a word (or it means the words which admit of this mental process.".......)"

From this he derives the following conclusions:—

1. That his grammar does not treat of those Saṃjñās or conventional names which are known and settled otherwise.

2. That this term Saṃjñā must be understood in our rule to concern only such conventional names as have an etymology.

3. That it applies also to grammatical terms which admit of an etymology, but not to those which are merely grammatical symbols.

4. That such terms as ṭi, ghu and bha, were known and settled before Pāṇini's grammar, but that, nevertheless, they are defined by Pāṇini because they are not etymological terms.

These conclusions of Goldstucker are based on an incorrect interpretation of the rule and the Mahābhāṣya and Pradīpa on it. The correct interpretations of these texts must be as follows:—

Pāṇini: तदशिष्यं संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात् ।

By 'tad' he refers to the Yuktavadbhāvaśāstra, i. e., the concord of gender and number of primitive and derivative nouns and of attributes and substantives, regarding which he has already given two rules, namely, लुपि युक्तवद्व्यक्तिवचने and विशेषणानां चाजातेः । (1.2.51-52).

The first rule says that when a Taddhita affix is dropped by Lup, then the gender and number of the Taddhita word (which has thus been derived) agree with those of the original word, e. g. पञ्चालानां निवासो जनपदः पञ्चालाः ।

The second says that the number and gender of the adjectives of such derivatives are the same as those of the latter, but not when expressing Jāti, e. g. पञ्चालाः रमणीयाः (but गोदौ ग्रामः, when Jāti is expressed).

The view contained in these two rules is in fact not Pāṇini's but that of some of his predecessors. Kāśikā therefore has on P. 1.2.51 the remark:

व्यक्तिवचने इति च लिङ्गसंख्ययोः पूर्वाचार्यनिर्देशस्तदीयमेवेदं सूत्रम् ।
तथा चास्य प्रत्याख्यानं भविष्यति—तदशिष्यं संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वादिति ।

Pāṇini thinks that no hard and fast rule can be laid down regarding gender and number which more or less depend on usage, and refutes the view of his predecessors in the next rule - तदशिष्यं संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात् ।

"This[46] (concord of gender and number, of primitive and derivative nouns, and of attributes and substantives, need not be taught (or approved) because it has the authority of saṃjñā (or conventional term or idiom).

The agreement between the number and gender of the nouns and attributes; of primary and secondary words formed by suffix rejections, is not an approved syntax. The gender and number of particular derivatives or adjectives are not blindly to be fixed by the primary words or the governed substantives; but it is a matter more or less of usage or idiom; and no hard and fast rule can be laid down for it. Thus the word दारा: 'wife' has the form of masculine plural, but is always applied to female singular; similarly आप: 'water' is always feminine plural in form; so also गृहा:,वर्षा:, सिकता:. This Sūtra, therefore, modifies the former Sūtras, and leaves the whole question of syntactic agreement to be decided by usage and idiom."

In Pāṇini's grammar 'Saṃjñā' usually (when formed with the Karaṇa aṇ) means a technical term; but, since the problem of technical terms has no relation whatsoever to the subject at issue here, namely, the concord of gender and number of derivative and primitive words, it is here taken as ending with the Bhāva aṇ, i .e ., as an abstract noun meaning cognition or, to be clear, understanding by convention. It is true that this Pāda in the beginning deals with some technical terms and the meaning of saṃjñā which one understands here from the context, is 'a technical term', but since the meaning decided by the context does not have any bearing on the subject dealt with in the Sūtra, and since Sāmarthya, i. e., the potence or the indicative power of words (one of the six factors given by Jaimini[47], which fixes the meaning of a word in a given passage in accordance with its bearing on the subject which is at issue) has greater weight than Prakaraṇa, i. e., context, Saṃjñā is

---

46. Vasu, Trans. of the S. Kaumudī, Vol. I. pp. 725-726
47. See Sūtra 3.3.14

here interpreted not as 'a technical term' but as 'Saṃpratyaya', i.e., Rūḍhi or convention. What Pāṇini means is this : The gender and number of a word are more or less matters[48] of usage and the efforts of even competent grammarians to fix them cannot turn out successfull. In such instances as 'गोदौ ग्रामः' 'हरीतक्यः फलानि' etc., the number or gender of the adjective is justified by convention, i. e., Rūḍhi. Hence, in Pāṇini's view, there is no need to assume such a nominal adjectve as derivative which has preserved the gender or number of the original word. Pāṇini thus differs from his predecessors onthis point. All this is made clear by Kaiyaṭa who explains the Mahābhāṣya on this Sūtra

किं या एताः कृत्रिमाष्टिघुभादिसंज्ञास्तत्प्रामाण्यादशिष्यम् । नेत्याह ।
संज्ञानं संज्ञा—

as follows :—

किं या एता इति। प्रत्यासत्त्याश्रयेण प्रश्नः । नेत्याहेति। प्रत्यासत्तेः सामर्थ्यं बलवत् । न हि टिघुभादिसंज्ञानां प्रमाणत्वं युक्तवद्भावशास्त्रस्याशिष्यत्वे हेतुरुपपद्यते। सम्बन्धाभावात्। संज्ञानमिति। अवगमः संप्रत्यय इत्यर्थः। तत्र यथापो दाराः सिकता वर्षा इत्युक्ते लिङ्गसंख्यावगतिरुत्पद्यमाना प्रमाणम्, एवं पञ्चालावरणा इत्यादावपि। न च पञ्चालादयो यौगिका अपि तु जनपदादीनां संज्ञास्ततो योगानवगमात् तद्धितो नोत्पद्यते इति लुबपि न वक्तव्यः ॥

Nāgeśa :

अवगमः संप्रत्यय इत्यर्थः। भावेऽडन्तो यौगिकः संज्ञाशब्द इत्यर्थः।
प्रतीतिप्रामाण्यमवश्यमाश्रयणीयमित्याह························ ।

The question of Patañjali is not, as Goldstucker thinks, suggested by the rule of analogy, but by the Paribhāṣā

कृत्रिमाकृत्रिमयोः कृत्रिमे कार्यसंप्रत्ययः ।

According to this paribhāṣā, the expression संज्ञा in Pāṇini's grammar can mean only technical terms. Why Patañjali instances only such terms as टि, घु, भ etc., will be presently made clear. Goldstucker's explanation of Patañjali's answer- "a name which has a real meaning, that may be traced etymologically," - is against

48. Cf. the statement लिङ्गमशिष्यं लोकाश्रयत्वाल्लिङ्गस्य which one very often comes across in the various commentaries on Pāṇini; cf. also such words as आपः, दाराः, etc. given by Kaiyaṭa.

Pradīpa and Udyota which interpret Saṃjñāna as संप्रत्ययः, and since the word here ends in a Bhāva-Pratyaya, it is evidently incorrect also. He translates Kaiyaṭa's प्रत्यासत्ति and सामर्थ्य by 'analogy' and context' respectively. The meanings of these two words are so well established as not to admit of this interpretation. Nāgeśa gives their unequivocal equivalents: प्रकरणाल्लिङ्ग बलवदित्यर्थः. Above all, Goldstucker clearly forgets that the topic dealt with in the Sūtra is far from having any relation to the problem of the technical terms. We have, therefore, to find a solution for this problem of the Saṃjñās not in this Sūtra, nor in the Mahābhāṣya etc. on it, but elsewhere as shown below.

What we can safely say :-

I think we shall not be wrong if according to Patañjali's oft-repeated statement[49] संज्ञा नाम यतो न लघीयः; कुत एतत्? लघ्वर्थं हि संज्ञाकरणम्, we decide that all such monosyllabic terms as ṭi, ghu, bha, ghi, etc., are the inventions of Pāṇini whose object it is to secure brevity to the largest extent. The very fact that Patañjali instances only such terms as being understood primarily by Saṃjñā in Pāṇini's work points to this conclusion. Macdonell also seems to hold a similar view when he says:[50] "Those of Pāṇini's terms which are real words, whether they describe the phenomenon as sam-āsa 'compound or express a category by an example, as dvi-gu 55 (two-cow) 'numeral compound', are probably all borrowed from predecessors. Most of his technical terms are arbitrary groups of letters resembling algebraic symbols." In the Mahābhāṣya on P. 1. 2. 53 Patañjali instances ṭi, ghu, bha, etc., as Kṛtrimasaṃjñās; and the suggestion that these are invented by Pāṇini is transparent in it.

The Mahāsaṃjñās

As regards the Mahāsaṃjñās there is no safe criterion to decide their authorship. Probably most of them are borrowed by Pāṇini from his predecessors. But it must be noted that the adoption of these instead of simpler terms like ṭi, ghu, bha, etc., has various purposes. In certain cases it is to teach that what has been denoted by them must be in accordence with their respective

49. See the Mahābhāṣya on P. 1.1.22, 26. 32, etc.
50. A Sanskrit Grammar, Introdution p. 9.

etymological meanings. This is clearly borne out by such statements of Patañjali as the following:—

> अथवा महतीयं संज्ञा क्रियते । संज्ञा च नाम यतो न लघीयः । कुत एतत् ? लघ्वर्थं हि संज्ञाकरणम् । तत्र महत्याः संज्ञायाः करण एतत्प्रयोजनम् । अन्वर्थसंज्ञा यथा विज्ञायेत । संख्यायतेऽनया संख्येति ॥[51]

> अथवा महतीयं संज्ञा क्रियते । संज्ञा च नाम यतो न लघीयः । कुत एतत् ? लघ्वर्थं हि संज्ञाकरणम् । तत्र महत्याः संज्ञायाः करण एतत्प्रयोजनम्–अन्वर्थसंज्ञा यथा विज्ञायेत–सर्वादीनि सर्वनामसंज्ञानि भवन्ति । सर्वेषां नामानीति चातः सर्वनामानि ॥[52]

> प्रत्यय[53] इति महती संज्ञा क्रियते । संज्ञा च नाम यतो न लघीयः । कुत एतत् ? लघ्वर्थं हि संज्ञाकरणम् । तत्र महत्याः करण एतत् प्रयोजनम् । अन्वर्थसंज्ञा यथाविज्ञायेत—प्रत्याययतीति प्रत्यय इति ॥[54]

The definition of a few others is intended by Pāṇini to point out his difference from his predecessors in regard to them. For instance he defines Karmadhāraya as तत्पुरुषः समानाधिकरणः कर्मधारयः[55] (1.2.42) in order to bring those compounds under the category of Tatpuruṣa. His predecessors seem to have regarded the Karmadhārayas as a separate class. The Bṛhaddevatā, though much later than Pāṇini, preserves an earlier Vedic grammatical tradition when it says:

> द्विगुर्द्वन्द्वोऽव्ययीभावः कर्मधारय एव च ।
> पञ्चमस्तु बहुव्रीहिः षष्ठस्तत्पुरुषःस्मृतः ।[56]

---

51. 1.1.22
52. 1.1.26
53. 3.1.1.
54. There are also some more instances where Patañjali repeats this.
55. Cf. in the Prakriyāsarvasva:

    द्वयोर्गवोर्भवादिर्हि द्विगुर्यस्येह स द्विगुः
    द्वयो हि पदयोरेकद्रव्यवृत्याखिलं पदम् ॥
    क्रियासम्बन्धि यत्र स्यात्स शान्तः कर्मधारयः ॥

    Ssmāsaprakraṇa (Adyar Library Ms., 21. Q 3).
56. 2.105.

It is not clear what evidence Goldstucker[57] has got to say that Pāṇini is the first grammarian to employ the term Karmadhāraya in the sense stated by him.

There are yet a few other Mahāsaṃjñās, e. g., Udātta, Anudātta, Svarita, Saṃhitā, etc., which are undoubtedly borrowed by Pāṇini from ancient phonetical treatises and whose definitions in the Aṣṭādhyāyī are only to acquaint the Mandabuddhi, i. e. one who has not studied the Prātiśākhyas or the Śikṣās, with their meanings. Commenting on P.1.2.32 Patañjali says:-

अन्वाख्यानमेव तर्हीदं मन्दबुद्धेः ॥

Later commentators and the Saṃjñāśāstra

It is perhaps deserving of mention here that the question whether this Saṃjñāśāstra teaches something new which is not known otherwise, i.e., Apūrvavidhi, or only seeks to restrict the meanings of thease terms which are otherwise known, i. e., Niyamavidhi, receives serious attention in later commentaries. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. thinks that it is a Niyama Śāstra. In the Śabda-kaustubha he says:

मदायशास्त्रे वृद्धिशब्देनादैच एव ग्राह्या इति नियमार्थं सूत्रारम्भात् ।[58]

This has the support of the following Vākyapadīya:-

व्यवहाराय नियमः संज्ञायाः संज्ञिनि क्वचित् ।
नित्य एव तु सम्बन्धो डित्थादिषु गवादिवत् ॥[59]

According to Nāgeśa, it is a Vidhi śāstra. In the Laghuśabdenduśekhara he says :

सर्वशब्दानां सर्वार्थवाचकत्वेऽपि वाचकत्वस्य गृहीतस्यैव बोधजनकतया
संज्ञाशास्त्राणामज्ञातशक्तिज्ञापकतया विधित्वम् ॥[60]

That these terms have only their technical meanings in Pāṇini's grammar is only a geneıal rule. In a few exceptional cases their ordinary meanings have also to be accepted, justification for this being found in the maxim व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्नहि सन्देहादलक्षणम् ।

57. Pāṇini. p. 167
58. P. 86. Chaukamba edition.
59. 2. 369
60. Vol. I. P. 55 Kasi Sanskrit Series.

In his commentary on P. 1.1.22 Patañjali says:

न यथा लोके तथा व्याकरणे । उभयगतिः पुनरिह भवति । अन्यत्रापि नावश्यमिहैव । तद्यथा—कर्तुरीप्सिततमं कर्मेति कृत्रिमा कर्मसंज्ञा । कर्मप्रदेशेषु चोभयगतिर्भवति । कर्मणि द्वितीयेति कृत्रिमस्य ग्रहणम् । कर्तरि कर्मव्यतीहारे इत्यत्राकृत्रिमस्य । तथा साधकतमं करणमिति कृत्रिमा करणसंज्ञा । करणप्रदेशेषु चोभयगतिर्भवति । कर्तृकरणयोस्तृतीयेति कृत्रिमस्य ग्रहणम् । शब्दवैरकलहाभ्रकण्वमेघेभ्यः करणे इत्यत्राकृत्रिमस्य । तथाधारोऽधिकरणमिति कृत्रिमाधिकरणसंज्ञा । अधिकरणप्रदेशेषु चोभयगतिर्भवति । सप्तम्यधिकरणे चेति कृत्रिमस्य ग्रहणम् । विप्रतिषिद्धं चानधिकरणवाचीत्यत्राकृत्रिमस्य ।

CHAPTER III

ITS. (ANUBANDHAS)

Macdonell's[61] view that 'it' is an abbreviation of 'iti' ('thus', meaning an indicatory letter) does not seem to be correct when we think that though a Pratyāhāra formed with an 'it' indicates certain letters, an 'it' by itself cannot do so; otherwise, the other member of a Pratyāhāra would also, on that score, be called an 'it.' Further, the contraction does not save anything, and Pāṇini would not have resorted to it; 'उपदेशेऽजनुनासिक इति' is not much longer than 'उपदेशेऽजनुनासिक इत् ।'

The important difference between the two members of a Pratyāhāra is that while the first stands, the second disappears. It is to emphasise this difference that the second member has been given by Pāṇini the name 'it' which means 'that which goes' or 'that which disappears'. This is the traditional view. It is given in the following Śabdaratna.

> न च लोपाभावे इदिति महासंज्ञाकरणात् संज्ञापि नेति वाच्यम् ।
> महासंज्ञयैव लोपसिद्धया तस्य लोप इत्यस्य वैयर्थ्यापत्तेः ॥[62]

On this Bhairavī comments:

> इदिति त्वेतीतीदित्यर्थकमिति लोपो भविष्यतीत्याशयः ।

According to the traditional view, it is thus a Mahāsaṃjñā. If Pāṇini intends it to be only a Laghusaṃjñā, i.e., a monosyllabic symbol, we may attempt to give some explanation. The following has suggested to me.

As Pāṇini uses both vowels and cosonants as 'its', he wants to adopt a symbol consisting of both. He takes इ and not अ, because, as is revealed on a close examination, the latter, i.e., अ nowhere occurs as an 'it' having a technical purpose. We have आदित (P.7.2.16), इदित (7.1.58), ईदित् (7.2.14), उदित् (1.1.69), ऊदित (7.2.44), ऋदित् (7·4.2) लृदित (3.1.55) एदित (7.2.5) and ओदित् (8.2.45); but not अदित् anywhere.

---

61. A Sankrit Grammar, Introduction, p. 9
62. Part I, p. 26, Kasi Sankrit Series.

Among consonants he selects त् probably for the following reasons. He does not take क्, because इक् occurs as a Pratyāhāra (P.1.1.3, etc.) He does not take ख् or घ्, because he does not usually give the Mahāprāṇas as 'its'. Even in a few instances like खमुच् (P. 3.4.25), खश् (3.2.28), घञ् (3.3.16), घुरच् (3.2.161), etc., where they are given as Anubandhas, they occur only at the beginning of the grammatical elements and not at the end. It must also be noted that none of the Pratyāhārasūtras have Mahāprāṇas as 'its'; and this is probably because a Mahāprāṇa is more difficult than an Alpaprāṇa to pronounce at the end of a word. There is also the fear that a Mahāprāṇa may not remain there as such, but may be changed into the corresponding Alpaprāṇa (Cf. P. 8.2.39 etc.). For similar reasons, Pāṇini does not give Tṛtīyas as 'its' except ड्. Even in the case of ड् it may be noted that, like the Mahāprāṇa 'its' noted above, it never occurs at the end of a grammatical element as an 'it'. ड् occurs as an 'it' in the following instances:-

डच्, डट्, डण्, डतमच्, डतरच्, डति, डा, डाच्, डाप्, डु, डुपच्, ड्मतुप्, ड्य, ड्यण्, ड्यत्, ड्या, ड्वलच्, ड्वुन्।

He does not take ङ्, because इङ् occurs as a root and is likely to create confusion in instances like इङ्धार्योः शत्रकृच्छ्रिणि (3. 2. 130). He does not take च् because इच् occurs as a Pratyāhāra (P 6.1. 104 etc.). छ्, ज्, and झ् are not taken for the reasons stated above. इञ् occurs as a termination in 4. 1. 95, etc. इट् occurs as an Āgama in 7.2.35, etc. ठ्, ड् and ढ् are not taken for the reasons already stated. इण् occurs as a Pratyāhāra in P. 8.3.39. It is त् which thus remains in this process of elimination and which appropriately forms the symbol इत्.

Its and their various technical purposes[63].

आ	P. 7.2.16
इ	7.1.58
ई	7.2.14
उ	7.2.56
ऊ	7.2.44

62. Part I, p. 26, Kashi Sanskrit Series.
63. Where there are more than one reference, each relates to a separate purpose.

ऋ	7.4.2
ए	7.2.5
ओ	8.2.45

क् 1.1.46; 1.1.5;6.1.15ff; 6.1.39; 6.1.15; 6.4.19ff; 6.4.24; 6.4.34; 6.4.37; 6.4.42ff; 6.4.63; 6.4.66; 6.4.98; 6.4.109ff; 6.4.120ff; 7.4.22ff; 7.4.40ff; 7.4.69ff; 2.4.36; 7.2. 11ff; 6.1.165; 7.2.118.

ख् 6.3.66

घ् 7.3.52

ङ् 1.3.12; 6.1.186; 1.2.1ff; 3.4.103; 7.2.81; 1.1.5; 6.1.16; 6.4.15; 6.4.19ff; 6.4.24; 6.4.34; 6.4.37; 6.4.42ff; 6.4.63ff; 6.4.66ff; 6.4.98ff; 6.4.109ff; 7.4.32ff; 3.4.99ff; 1.4.6.

च् 6.1.163ff.

ञ् 1.3.72; 1.2.1; 7.2.115ff; 7.3 32; 7.3.54; 6.1.197; 4.3.155; 2.4 58;

ट् 1.1.46; 3.4.79; 4.1.15;

ड् 6 4.143; 6.4.142;

ण् 1.2.1; 7.2.115ff; 7.3.34ff; 7.1.91; 7.3.32; 7.3.33; 7.2.117; 7.1.90; 7.1.92.

त् 6.1.185.

न् 6 1.197; 6.2.50.

प् 3.1.4; 3.4.87; 3.4.86; 3.4.92; 1.2.4; 7.3.89ff; 7.3.87; 7.3.93ff; 7.3.99ff; 6.1.192; 6.1.71.

म् 6.4.92; 6.4.93; 1.1.47.

र् 6.1.217.

ल् 6.1.193.

श् 1.1.55; 3.4.113; 3.3.60ff; 6.1.45; 7.3.75ff;

ष् 3.3.104; 4.1.4.

स् 1.4.16.

Its have been defined byPāṇini in the following aphorisms:—

उपदेशेऽजनुनासिक इत् ।
हलन्त्यम् ।
न विभक्तौ तुस्माः ।
आदिर्ञिटुडवः ।
षः प्रत्ययस्य ।
चुटू ।
लशक्वतद्धिते ।   (1.3.2–8)

The 'its' can be divided broadly into four classes:—

1. Its as explanatory elements.

2. Its as phonetic elements, i.e., those whose purpose is only to aid enunciation. This is according to Nāgeśa. According to other commentators, Mukhasukhārthas are not called 'its'. Perhaps Pāṇini also does not intend to include them among 'its'; for we have seen that in adopting a symbol for Anubandhas he does not take अ because it is nowhere used by him as an 'it' having a technical purpose; according to him only those which are employed for technical purposes are 'its'.

3. Its which serve a double purpose.

4. Its which serve to distinguish one grammatical element from another.

Those which have technical meanings may be called explanatory, e. g., ण् in the Pratyaya अण् which indicates the Vṛddhi of its base. Instances of this class are numerous.

Those which do not imply any technical meanings, but only help enunciation, may be called phonetic elements, most of them being vowels inserted between consonants. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita gives the following instances:—

> औतस्तकार उच्चारणार्थः ।[64]
> इकारस्तूच्चारणार्थः ।[65]
> पकारोपर्यकार उच्चारणार्थः ।[66]

In his commentary on P. 7.1.86 Haradatta says :

> स्थान्यादेशे च तपरकरणं मुखसुखार्थम् ।

The अ between the consonants in अकङ् (4.1.97), अनङ् (7.1.75), अयङ् (7.4.22), आनङ् (6.3.25), इनङ् (4.1.126), etc., इ in अनिच् (5.4.124), असिच् (5.4.122), इमनिच् (6.4.154), तसिल् (5.3.7),

---

64. Praudhamanoramā, p. 366.
65. Ibid, p. 400.
66. Ibid, p. 165.

etc., and उ in अतसुच् (5.3.28), इथुक् (5.2.53), इनुण् (3.3.44), कृत्वसुच् (2.3.64), कसुन् (3.4.17), etc., are all Mukhasukhārthas.

Its which serve a double purpose:—In the terminations matup (5 2 94), ḍmatup (4.2.87), atṛn (3.2.104), īyasun (5.3.57), tṛ (6.4.127), tṛc (3.3.169), tṛn (3.2.135), vatup (5.2.39), etc., अ and ऋ not only help enunciation, but, by being Anubandhas, also promote the operation of such Sūtras as उगितश्च (4-1.6)—

उगिदचां सर्वनामस्थानेऽधातोः (7.1.170) etc.

The अ *in* लण् *of the Akṣarasamāmnāya:*—

Whether the अ in the Sūtra लण् of the Akṣarasamāmnāya is a simple Mukhasukhārtha vowel or an Anunāsika vowel, i.e., according to the rule उपदेशेऽजनुनासिक इत्, an Anubandha by which a Pratyāhāra, namely, ra (standing for ṛ and ḷ) can be formed, is a question which receives much controversial attention in later commentaries. There is in fact nothing of an evidence in the Munitraya texts to regard this as anything more than an ordinary Mukasukhārtha vowel. The idea of having a Pratyāhāra of 'r' with this 'a', i. e., rapratyāhāra seems to have suggested itself first to Bhartṛhari who commenting on the Mahābāṣya—

> लृकारस्य लपरत्वं वक्ष्यामि तच्चावश्यं वक्तव्यम् ।[67]–

says :

> व्याख्यास्यामीत्यर्थः । कथम् ? प्रत्याहारे रट् लण् इति लकारे योऽकारः असावनुनासिकः प्रतिज्ञास्यते ।[68]

From the expression प्रतिज्ञास्यते it must be obvious to discerning minds that Pāṇini does not give it as a nasal. Kaiyaṭa takes for granted that it is an Anunāsika, and, in his explanation of the above Mahābhāṣya he goes one step forward, from Pratijñā to Vyākhyāna. Says he:

> व्याख्यास्यामीत्यर्थः । रपर इत्यत्र र इति लगिति लकाराकारेण प्रत्याहार आश्रियते । तत्रान्तरतम्यादृकारस्याण् रपरः लृकारस्य लकारः ।[69]

67. 1.1.9, V. 5.
68 Bhāṣyapradīpikā, Adyar Library Transcript, 39, G. 17, p. 402
69. Vol. I, p. 226.

Bhaṭṭoji[70] rows in the same boat with Bhartṛhari and Kaiyaṭa.

Nāgeśa's criticism:—

At[71] Nāgeśa's hands the above view meets with the refutation which it deserves. His criticism may be summarised as follows:—

Firstly, if the अ in लण् is an Anunāsika which can form a Pratyāhāra, Pāṇini, who always wants to secure economy in expression, would certainly have the Pratyāhāra ra in lieu of ल्र in 7.2.2. and ya in lieu of यण् in 6.1.77, etc. Secondly, the Ślokavārtika—

प्रत्याहारेऽनुबन्धानां कथमज्ग्रहणेषु न ।[72]

raises and answers the question why such augments as ṇ,k, etc., which are read among vowels, i.e., Acs are not taken as such (as Svaras); but neither Kātyāyana nor Patañjali raises a similar question regarding the 'a' in the aphorism लण् which is read among the consonants. If it is an Anubandha like k or ṇ, such a question must have been raised and answered. The third point against it is this: A proban pointed out by Patañjali to infer the non-denotation of the consonant Anubandhas by the Pratyāhāra Ac is लोपश्च बलवत्तरः[73] i. e., the obligatoriness of the elision of these. If the 'a' in लण् is taken as an Anunāsika, i. e., an Anubandha, there would be a partial non-establishment of the pervasion of the subject by the proban which would vitiate the inference. The proposition is this :

अनुबन्धव्यवहारयोग्याः प्रत्याहारजन्यबोधाविषयाः, बलवत्तरलोपप्रतियोगित्वात् ॥

We cannot have the Ac-Pratyāhāra before having the Hal-Pratyāhāra; for it is only after interpreting the rule हलन्त्यम् (1.3.3) that we are able to interpret the rules आदिरन्त्येन सहेता (1.1.71) and तस्य लोपः (1.3.9) on which depends the formation of the Pratyāhāra Ac; the term 'it' in the latter rules cannot be understood without the former. So much so, when we are at a stage of deciding

70. See the S. Kaumudī on p. 1.3.2.
71. Part I. p. 9 sqq.
72. See the Mahābhāṣya on हयवरट् ।
73. See the Mahābhāṣya on हयवरट्

what is meant by Hal, the 'a' in the aphorism लण् cannot be elided as an Anubandha, the elision being known only by the rule तस्य लोप: which has yet to be interpreted. Thus the 'a', one of the subjects of our proposition, is not pervaded by the Hetu बलवत्तरलोपप्रतियोगित्वम्. Consequently (when not elided) it becomes a consonant; and the undesirable result of this would be the elision of 's' in such instances as सोऽस्ति, etc., according to एतत्तदो: सुलोपोऽकोरनञ्समासे हल् । (6.1.132) etc. Hence Nāgeśa thinks that this 'a' in the aphorism लण् is only a Mukhasukhārtha.

The inclusion of Mukhasukhārthas among 'its'

We have here included Mukhasukhārthas among 'its' but it may be noted that there is a difference of opinion regarding this among later commentators. All of them except Nāgeśa do not accept them as 'its'. According to Nāgeśa[74], they connot be dropped if they are not 'its'. He has the following Vārtika and Mahābhāṣya to support him :–

P. 6.1.185 : तित्स्वरितम् ।

Kātyāyana : तिति प्रत्ययग्रहणम् ।

Patañjali :

तिति प्रत्ययग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । इह मा भूत्-ऋत इद्धातोः (7-1-100) किरति । गिरति । तर्त्हि वक्तव्यम् । न वक्तव्यम् । नैष तकारः । कस्तर्हि ? दकारः........ ॥

P. 7. 1. 25 : अद्डतरादिभ्यः पञ्चभ्यः ।

Kātyāyana : अद्भावे पूर्वसवर्णप्रतिषेधः ।

Patañjali :

अद्भावे पूर्वसवर्णस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । कतरत्तिष्ठति । कतरत्पश्यति ।

Kātyāyana : सिद्धमनुनासिकोपधत्वात् ।

74. See the Laghuśabdenduśekhara, Part I, pp. 407-408 and the Mahābhāṣya on 6-1-185.

Patañjali :

सिद्धमेतत् । कथम् ? अनुनासिकोपधोऽच्छ्वद: करिष्यते ।

If the Mukhasukhārtha 't' of 'it' in P. 7-1-100 is not an 'it', there is no possibility of applying P. 6-1-185 to such instances as किरति, गिरति, etc., and Kātyāyana's emendation तिति प्रत्ययग्रहणम् thus becomes unnecessary. We have, therefore, to infer that both Kātyāyana and Patañjali regard even Mukhasukhārthas as 'its'; otherwise the operation of P. 6-1-185 could have been prevented in these instances simply by saying that the 't' is only a Mukhasukhārtha, and not an 'it'.

In the second instance Kātyāyana and Patañjali take the 'a' of 'ad' as an Anunāsika in order to drop 'it' as an 'it'. The Savarṇa-dīrgha is thus prevented in katarad (Katara + ad). If Mukhasukhārthas can be dropped without being 'its', there is no need to regard this as an Anunāsika, i. e., an 'it'. Here it must be remembered that even Nāgeśa includes the Mukhasukhārthas among 'its' only when the former are Vidheyas and not Anuvādyas because it is only in the former case that one of the conditions to be called 'its', namely व्यवसितान्त्यत्व is obtained[75].

Its which distinguish one grammatical element from another

In a few instances 'its' serve to distinguish one grammatical element from another. For instance, the 'i' of 'ṅasi' (4.1.2) differentiates it from ṅas (4.1.2); the Anubandha 'i' of iñi (3.2.93) differentiates it from 'in' (3.2.24); the 't' differentiates 'ant' from 'an' (4.1.2).

'g' as an 'it'

It may be noted here in passing that neither Pāṇini nor Kātyāyana gives 'g' as an 'it'. A Ślokavārtika quoted and commented upon by Patañjali in the Mahābhāṣya on 3.2.139 gives it. It is accepted by Patañjali. Apart from this we do not have any remarkable addition to the list of 'its' by Patañjali.

---

75. For further information on this subject see the Laghuśabdenduśekhara, part I, pp. 408-410; of the Mahābhāṣya on 1.3.3. व्यवसितान्त्यो हलित्संज्ञो भवतीति वक्तव्यम्

CHAPTER IV

The authorship of the Akṣarasamāmnāya

The next problem in Pāṇini that deserves to engage our attention here is the one relating to the authorship of the Akṣarasamāmnāya. We cannot entertain any reasonable doubt regarding the authorship of this Ānupūrvī, i. e., the Samāmnāya, which, displaying amply the resourcefulness of the master genius Pāṇini, itself places this beyond doubt; yet some evidence has to be adduced here in order to make it clear that the legend which says that this Samāmnāya is a revelation to Pāṇini from Śiva is not a very old one and that neither Kātyāyana, Patañjali, nor Bhartṛhari knows it. It would further interest us to know the source of this legend and to see how later commentators in their enthusiasm for making the Samāmnāya a Śruti, tamper with certain texts.

Pāṇini's authorship of the Akṣarasamāmnāya is clearly borne out by the following evidences.

1. Explaining the Vārtika व्याख्यानाच्च द्विरुक्तितः (P. 130, Vol. I. N. S. Edn.) Patañjali says:

एतच्च ज्ञापयत्याचार्यो भवत्येषा परिभाषा व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्नहि संदेहादलक्षणम् ।

By the term Ācārya he should here also, as in various other places, mean Pāṇini. It has already been pointed out that he always refers to Pāṇini by this term.

2. Towards the end of Paspaśā, both Kātyāyana and Patañjali make it plain that the object of this Samāmnāya is to have the Pratyāhāras which Pāṇini uses in writing his grammar; in other words Pāṇini arranged the Varṇas in this order and added the Anubandhas to them in order to have Pratyāhāras. We have there the following :

Kātyāyana : वृत्तिसमवायार्थ उपदेशः ।

Patañjali :

का पुनर्वृत्तिः ? शास्त्रप्रवृत्तिः । समवायो वर्णानामानुपूर्व्येण संनिवेशः ।

Kātyāyana : अनुबन्धकरणार्थश्च ।

Patañjali :

अनुबन्धकरणार्थश्च वर्णानामुपदेशः ।

अनुबन्धानासंक्ष्यामीति ।

वृत्तिसमवायश्चानुबन्धकरणं च प्रत्याहारार्थम् ।।

3. After a long and important prolegomenon, Patañjali introduces us to his text with the words :

कथं पुनरिदं भगवतः पाणिनेराचार्यस्य लक्षणं प्रवृत्तम् ।

His commentary on the Akṣarasamāmnāya comes after this and should form part of the text.

4. From Bhartṛhari also we know that this Samāmnāya or Saṃniveśa (arrangement of Varṇas in this particular order) was not current before Pāṇini's time. He rightly calls it Pāṇini's Svānupūrvī. Says he :

न स्वेषां स्वरूपावधारणार्थं उपदेशः । किं तु स्वानुपूर्व्यर्थोऽनेनानुपूर्व्येण शास्त्रे किंचित्कुर्युरिति ।[76]

On each of the Sūtras of the Samāmnāya Kāśikā says :

इतं करोति प्रत्याहारार्थम् ।

A good deal of evidence of this kind can be adduced; but since the above is sufficient for our purpose, we may proceed to investigate the source of the legend which says that the Sūtras of the Akṣarasamāmnāya were vouchsafed to Pāṇini by Śiva at the end of the penance done by the former on the Himalayas.

The Source of the Legend :–

In the beginning of his Kāśikā in which he gives a symbolic interpretation of the Sūtras of the Akṣarasamāmnāya, Nandikeśvara says :

76. Adyar Library Transcript, P. 117

नृत्तावसाने नटराजराजो ननाद ढक्कां नवपञ्चवारम् ।
उद्धर्तुकामः सनकादिसिद्धानेतद्विमर्शे शिवसूत्रजालम् ॥

From the evidence adduced above, we know that this legend is not known to Bhartṛhari and is therefore of a much later invention. We have now to answer the question how this arose.

Its probable source :-

A careful study of the Kāśikā of Nandikeśvara and its commentary by Upamanyu in comparison with works on Kāśmir Śaivaism reveals the fact that Nandikeśvara is indebted for this legend to the latter which record a similar one with regard to the origin of the Śiva Sūtras which laid the foundation of that school of Philosophy. The Śiva Sūtras[77] are said to have been revealed to Vasugupta by Śiva. In the Spandavṛtti Kallaṭa says :

लब्धं महादेवगिरौ महेशस्वप्नोपदिष्टाच्छिवसूत्रसिन्धोः ।
स्पन्दामृतं यद्वसुगुप्तपादैः श्रीकल्लटस्तत्प्रकटीचकार ॥

Mystic[78] interpretation of the Varṇas is a common feature of some Tantra works relating to this school of Philosophy. Both Nandikeśvara and his commentator Upamanyu flourished in Kashmir in the golden days of the Advaita Śaivaism.

The following verse in the Kāśikā of Nandikeśvara clearly expounds the Śakti Tattva of that School :

अकारो ब्रह्मरूपः स्यान्निर्गुणः सर्ववस्तुषु ।[79]
चित्कलामिं समाश्रित्य जगद्रूप उणीश्वरः ॥

The commentator Abhimanyu is quite frank about it. He begins his [80]work thus :-

---

77. See J. C. Chatterji, Kāśmir Śaivaism, P. 22ff. The different versions of this legend have been examined in this work.
78. See the Mālinīvijayottara Tantra, Adhi. 3-4
79. Cf. the other verses also. See Chatterji, Ibid, p. 63 ff.
80. Printed in the N. S. Edn. of the Mahābhāṣya (P. 132 ff.)

नमः शिवाय देवाय सर्वज्ञाय परात्मने ।
यस्योन्मेषनिमेषाभ्यां व्यक्ताव्यक्तमिदं जगत् ॥
गुरुं शिवं कुमारं च शिवतत्त्वविशारदम् ।
प्रणम्य नन्दिकेशादीञ्छिवभक्तान्मुहुर्मुहुः ॥

Ends thus :

हकारः शिववर्णः स्यादिति शैवागमस्थितिरिति शिवम् ।

This commentary is named Vimarśinī. It is very interesting to note that Kṣemarāja's commentary on the Śiva Sūtras relating to Kāśmir Śaivaism, too, has the same title.

The doctrine of the Logos,[81] i. e., the Parāvāk is common to both the Vyākaraṇa Philosophy and Kāśmir Śaivaism; but it is not our object to enter here into any comparison or to find out which one borrows it from the other. Suffice it to say that the source of the legend which makes the Samāmnāya a revelation, is the one described above.

How later commentators tamper with texts :-

1. The Sūtras of the Akṣarasamāmnāya were originally called Pratyāhārasūtras. This original name is found in some old [82]manuscripts of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. The Vārtika प्रत्याहारेऽनुबन्धानां कथमज्ग्रहणेषु न ।[83] refers to these by this name. Explaining this Vārtika the Śābdikacintāmaṇi says : प्रत्याहारोऽत्राक्षरसमाम्नाय इति हरदत्तः ।[84] But in such later works as the Siddhāntakaumudī etc., we find at the end of the Samāmnāya the remark—

इति माहेश्वराणि सूत्राणि ।

2. The third verse of the Pāṇinīyaśikṣā originally read :

त्रिषष्टिश्च चतुष्षष्टिर्वर्णाः संभवतो मताः ।

This reading is found in an old Ms. of the Adyar Library bearing the shelf number 21. N. 4. But the reading that we now

81. See Chatterji, ibid, p. 6, (extract from the Tantrāloka); Kaul, Introduction to the Mālinīvijyayottara Tantra, p. 6ff.
82. 9. D. 10; 9. D. 60
83. See the Mahābhāṣya on हयवरट्
84. Adyar Library Transcript, Vol. I, p. 220

have as mostly current is वर्णाः शंभुमते मताः। The former reading is usually relegated to footnotes by modern editors.

3. At the end of the Pratyāhārāhnika Bhartṛhari says :

एवमस्य वाग्व्यवहारस्य न कश्चित्कर्तास्ति।[85]

Bhartṛhari does not refer here to the Akṣarasamāmnāya; but Nāgeśa quotes and interprets this as follows :-

हरिणा अस्याक्षरसमाम्नायस्य वाग्व्यवहारजनकस्य न कश्चित्कर्तास्त्येवमेव वेदे पारंपर्येण स्मर्यमाणमिति व्याख्यातम्॥[86]

According to this interpretation, the Samāmnāya is not only a revelation to Pāṇini from Śiva, but also an eternal Śruti.

The legend recorded in the verse—

यान्युज्जहार माहेशाद्व्यासो व्याकरणार्णवात्।[87]
तानि किं पदरत्नानि भान्ति पाणिनिगोष्पदे॥

by Dhanarāja is too baseless and absurd to deserve any consideration.

The rationale of the Akṣarasamāmnāya

The following analysis will also make it clear that Pāṇini arranges the Varṇas into this Samāmnāya for the purpose of having the various Pratyāhāras on which he bases his work.

Up to ए Pāṇini follows the usual order of the vowels which is seen also in Prātiśākhyas. He reads ओ after ए and औ after ऐ. Giving them in this order, Pāṇini is able to have the Pratyāhāras एङ् (P.1.1.2, 1.1.75, 6.1.69, 6.1.94, 6.1.109) and एच् (P. 1.1.1, 7.3.3, 8.2.106) respectively. The Ṛk-Prātiśākhya also gives the latter in the same order.

Cf. अकारर्कारावि उ ए ओ ऐ औ।[88]

85. Ibid. p. 111 (Adyar Library Transcript, 39. G. 17)
86. Udyota, Vol. I, p. 132.
87. Praṇavavāda of Gārgyāyaṇa, Bhagavandas, pp. 78-79, T.P.H.
88. P. 13, Benares Sanskrit Series. By placing ऋ after अ, this Prātiśākhya is perhaps attempting to give its original pronunciation.

Either one borrows from the other or both follow some ancient school of Phonetics which reads them in this order. Uvvaṭa explains this Ṛk-Prātiśākhya as follows :

अकारस्य इकारेण उकारेण एकारेण ओकारेण च
सह संधौ यान्यक्षराणि निष्पद्यन्ते तानि तथोच्यते ।[89]

ऋ and ऌ have to form a separate Sūtra as they cannot be included in एच् (P. 1.1.48, 6.1.45, 6.1.78, 8.2.107) or in अण् (P. 6.3.111, 7.4.13, etc).

Cf. पूर्वेणाण्ग्रहणाः सर्वे परेणेण्ग्रहणा मताः ।
ऋतेऽणुदित्सवर्णस्येत्येतदेकं परेण तु ॥[90]

But they have to be included in अक् (P. 6.1.101, 6.1.128). Hence ऋ and ऌ occupy this position.

Next comes ह which has to be included in अट् (P.8.4.2). In order to maintain Yathāsaṅkhya between इक् and यण् (P. 6.1.77, 1.1.45) Pāṇini does not read it somewhere after य. The repetition of this letter at the end has the advantage of its inclusion in शल् (P. 3.1.45)

Cf. हकारो द्विरुपात्तोऽयमटि शल्यपि वाञ्छता ।
अर्हेणाधुक्षदित्यत्र द्वयं सिद्धं भविष्यति ॥[91]

य व र and ल are read in the order of their corresponding vowels इ, उ, ऋ and ऌ. The other two advantages which Pāṇini gains by giving the semi-vowels in this order are these : (1) य् and व् are not denoted by रल् (P. 1.2.26); (2) य् is not denoted by वल् (P. 6.1.66 and 7.2.35).

ल् has to stand separate from the other semi-vowels, since it cannot be included in अट् (P. 8.4.2)

अण्, the Pratyāhāra formed by अ with ण् of लण्, is used in P. 1.1.69.

---

89. P. 20.
90. See the Mahābhāṣya, Vol. I, p. 130, N.S.Ed.
91. See the Prasāda, Part I, p. 14.

As regards the nasals, i.e., ञ, ङ, म, ण and न, Pāṇini follows the order in which he has to give the respective Tṛtīyas and Caturthas.

Cf. झभञ् । घढधष् । जबगडदश् ।

Why Pāṇini gives the latter in this order is explained below.

ञ, म, ङ, ण and न have to be placed here in order to be denoted by the Pratyāhāra यम् (P. 8.4.64).

Next come the Vargacaturthas. Only भ, घ, ढ and ध have to be denoted by भष् (P. 8.2.37). Being placed before भ, झ is thus excluded from भष्. By this arrangement Pāṇini gains another advantage also, namely, the inclusion of झ along with the other Caturthas in the Pratyāhāra झष् (P. 8.2.37 and 40).

The semi-vowels, nasals, झ and भ have to be denoted by यञ् (P.7.3.101). Hence झ and भ are given as a separate Sūtra before other Caturthas. As between झ and भ, झ deserves to be placed first, having regard to their established order which he follows also in the arrangement of the rest namely, घ, ढ and ध. From this it would be clear that he gives the Varṇas in the usual order wherever the exigencies of his grammar do not require their arrangement otherwise.

Next come the Varga-tṛtīyas, which are excluded from झष् (P. 8.2.37 and 40) and भश् (P. 8.2.37), but included in हश् (P. 6.1·114) and अश् (P. 8.3.17). He gives the Tṛtīyas in the order in which he has given the Caturthas in the previous Sūtras.

Now he has to arrange the Dvitīyas, the first among these, namely, ख is mentioned first. फ which has to be excluded from छव् (P. 8.3.37) is given next. The rest are arranged in their usual order.

In order that the Prathamas may not be mixed up with the Dvitīyas, he does not read the Sūtra कपय् between जबगडदश् and खफछठथचटतव्. This position of क and प has also two other advantages, namely, the denotation and non-denotation of these two by खर् (P. 8.3.15 and 8.4.55) and छव् (P. 8.3.7) respectively.

After the Vargyas we have ś, ṣ and s read in their usual order and at the right place. The purpose of the repetition of ह has already been stated above.

A question may be asked as to whether Pāṇini has while arranging the Varṇas as demanded by his Pratyāhāras, been able to maintain any phonological order ? A further examination enables us to answer this question as follows :–

He gives the vowels except ओ and ऐ in their usual order. As regards ओ and ऐ we have already noted that the Ṛk-Prātiśākhya also gives these vowels in this order. We have also noted the phonological reasons given by Uvvaṭa for this. Perhaps the same reasons have weighed with Pāṇini also. In the arrangement of consonants Pāṇini is guided more by the Bāhyaprayatnas than by the Ābhyantara-prayatnas or Sthānas. Thus the consonants which he reads from ह to द are those which are produced by the Bāhyaprayatnas, Saṃvāra, Nāda and Ghoṣa. From ख to स are those produced by Vivāra, Śvāsa and Aghoṣa.

Cf. खयां यमाः खयः⌣क⌣पौ विसर्गः शर एव च ।[92]
एते श्वासानुप्रदाना अघोषाश्च विवृण्वते ॥
कण्ठमन्ये तु घोषाः स्युः संवृता नादभागिनः ।

There is also one more point to be noted. Pāṇini arranges the consonants according to their respective places in the Vargas. Instead of beginning with the Prathamas and going up to the Pañcamas, he begins with the Pañcamas and comes down to the Prathamas. Perhaps this is warranted by the various Pratyāhāras which he has adopted for his work. First he gives all the Varga-Pañcamas; then the Caturthas; then the Tṛtīyas; then the Dvitīyas; and then the Prathamas. The Varṇas in the Pratyāhāra Sūtras are thus very thoughtfully arranged by Pāṇini. A better arrangement on which a work like the Aṣṭādhyāyī with its intricate system of Pratyāhāras could be based, cannot be thought of.

That inspite of the demands of the various Pratyāhāras that are absolutely necessary for his work, Pāṇini has been able to give the Varṇas in the Pratyāhāra Sūtras in a certain order is really one of his greatest achievements.

---

92. See the Siddhāntakaumudī and the Tattvabodhinī, p. 5, N. S. Edition.

Its and Pratāyāhāras are Paṇinyupajñas :—

From our study on 'its' and the Akṣarasamāmnāya it follows that Pāṇini was the first grammarian to use 'its' and Pratyāhāras; for it has been pointed out above that both these devices depend on the Akṣarasamāmnāya of which Pāṇini is undoubtedly the author. Of course, monosyllabic symbols are known to have been used by pre-Pāṇinian grammarians.

Cf. आङि चापः (P. 7.3.105)

Kāśikā आङिति पूर्वाचार्यनिर्देशेन तृतीयैकवचनं गृह्यते ।

बहुलं तणि[93] (P. 2.4.54)

Patañjali : किमिदं तणीति संज्ञाछन्दसोर्ग्रहणम् ।

Prauḍhamanoramā (P. 6.4.84) घणीति पुल्लिङ्गस्य प्राचां संज्ञा ।

But it must be noted that these symbols are used by them only as Saṃjñās and not either as Pratyāhāras or 'its'.

The Dhātupāṭha

One important fact emerges from the foregoing, namely, that Pāṇini is also the author of the Dhātupāṭha. Most of the Dhātus in the Dhātupāṭha are arranged according to their Anubandhas.

Cf. कत्थन्ताः षट्त्रिंशदनुदात्तेतः (S. Kaumudī on P. 8.4. 18)

The addition of the Anubandhas to the roots in the Dhātupāṭha has no other purpose than to bring in the operation of Pāṇini Sūtras like—

आदितश्च	7.2.16
इदितो नुम्धातोः	7.1.58
स्वरतिसूतिसूयतिधूञूदितो वा	7.2.44
पूषादिद्युताद्यॢदितः	3.1.55
ह्म्यन्तक्षणश्वसजागृणिश्व्येदिताम्	7.2.5

Thus it is reasonable that the author of the Dhātupāṭha should be identified with Pāṇini. Pāṇini's authorship of the Dhātupāṭha is made plain also by the Mahābhāṣya on P. 1.3.72. On that Sūtra Patañjali says :

तथाजातीयकाः खल्वाचार्येण स्वरितञितः पठिताः य उभयवन्तो येषां कर्त्रभिप्रायं चाकर्त्रभिप्रायं च क्रियाफलमस्ति ।

93. See also Kātyāyana on P. 3.2.8 and 4.1.52.

Ācārya is a term which Patañjali always uses when referring to Pāṇini.

The Gaṇapāṭha

That Pāṇini is also the author of the Gaṇapāṭha is apparent from the following Mahābhāṣya which finds solution for a difficulty which arises if Ākṛtipakṣa is accepted in the Aṣṭādhyāyī, namely, the denotation by a vowel of also such incorrectly pronounced ones of its kind as Saṃvṛta, Kala, etc., in the reading of Gaṇaśabdas which consist of vowels pronounced correctly, that is to say, devoid of all Doṣas. If the Gaṇapāṭha is non-Pāṇinian, Patañjali would not resort to this explanation; for, at the same place we see Patañjali fearing that the Śāstra would turn out non-Pāṇinian if Saṃvṛta, etc., are used instead of Anubandhas. It is thus evident that he thinks that the Gaṇapāṭha is also Pāṇinian. The Mahābhāṣya under reference is as follows :–

> आकृत्युपदेशात्सिद्धमिति चेत् संवृतादीनां प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । के पुनः संवृतादयः । संवृतः कलो ध्मात एणीकृतोऽर्धको ग्रस्तो निरस्तः प्रगीत उपगीतः क्ष्विण्णो रोमश इति ।[94]
>
> अपर आह—ग्रस्तं निरस्तमविलम्बितं निर्हतमम्बूकृतं ध्मातमथो विकम्पितम् ।
> सन्दष्टमेणीकृतमर्धकं द्रुतं विकीर्णमेताः स्वरदोषभावना इति ॥
>
> अतोऽन्ये व्यञ्जनदोषाः ॥ नैष दोषः । गर्गादिबिदादिपाठात्संवृतादीनां निवृत्तिर्भविष्यति । अस्त्यन्यद्गर्गादिबिदादिपाठे प्रयोजनम् । किम् । समुदायानां साधुत्वं यथा स्यादिति । एवं तर्ह्यष्टादशधा भिन्नां निवृत्तकलादिकामवर्णस्य प्रत्यापत्तिं वक्ष्यामि । सा तर्हि वक्तव्या ।
>
> लिङ्गार्था तु प्रत्यापत्तिः ।
>
> लिङ्गार्था सा तर्हि भविष्यति । तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् । यद्यप्येतदुच्यते । अथवैतर्ह्यनेकमनुबन्धशतं नोच्चार्यमित्संज्ञा च न वक्तव्या लोपश्च न वक्तव्यः । यदनुबन्धैः क्रियते तत्कलादिभिः करिष्यते । सिद्ध्यत्येवमपाणिनीयं तु भवति । यथान्यासमेवास्तु । ननु चोक्तमाकृत्युपदेशात्सिद्धमिति चेत् संवृतादीनां प्रतिषेध इति । परिहृतमेतद् गर्गादिबिदादिपाठात्संवृतादीनां निवृत्तिर्भविष्यति ॥

The Phiṭ Sūtra, Liṅgānuśāsana and the Uṇādi Sūtra

As regards such later works as the Phiṭ Sūtra and the Liṅgānuśāsana, no one has reasons to accept them as Pāṇini's works. The authorship of the Uṇādi Sūtra will be discussed later.

---

94. See the concluding portion of Paspaśā (Vol. I, pp. 13-14, Kielhorn's Ed).

CHAPTER V

The general scheme of the Aṣṭādhyāyī [95]

Chapter I : Saṃjñās and Paribhāṣās; Anubandhas bearing on mutation of roots; Ekaśeṣa; active and middle verbal terminations; Kāraka; Gatis and Karmapravacanīyas.

Chapter II : Compounds; Upapada; Ādeśas of stems; Ādeśas of roots or heteroclitic conjugation; Luk with reference to composition, derivation, etc.

Chapter III : Derivative roots; formation of tense-stems; Kṛts; conjugational Vibhaktis.

Chapter IV & V : Strīpratyayas; Taddhitas; Samāsānta-pratyayas.

Chapter VI–VII : Articulative-phonological and morphological processes; word-accent and compound-accent; processes in the Purvapada; vocalic changes.

Chapter VIII : Doubling of words: sentence-accent; Saṃhitā processes; Consonantal changes.

Pāṇini's defects :

A study on Pāṇini would be incomplete if we do not notice here his following three main defects.

1. Pāṇini's treatment of the Vedic language is not satisfactory; in no way does it help us to decide in what relation to his grammar does the Saṃhitā literature exactly stand. He leaves out of account a large number of Vedic words including those occurring in the Ṛk and Sāma Vedas. Perhaps his indifference to the Vedic language is deliberate; for, as we will see in the following pages, he writes his grammar only for the Bhāṣā and does not intend it to be a Vedāṅga text.

2. Though he is undoubtedly the greatest Sanskrit grammarian, Pāṇini, strangely enough, uses a few ungrammatical expressions. Patañjali gives the following instances.

95. For an excellent and more detailed account of this see Barend Faddegon, Studies on Pāṇini's Grammar, pp. 49Sqq.

तिर्यच्यपवर्गे (P. 3.4.60)

Patañjali :

अयुक्तोऽयं निर्देशः । तिरश्चीति भवितव्यम् । सौत्रो निर्देशः ।

अन्वच्यानुलोम्ये (P. 3.4.64)

Patañjali ;

अयुक्तोऽयं निर्देशः । अनूचीति भवितव्यम् । सौत्रोऽयं निर्देशः ।

प्रोक्ताल्लुक् (P. 4.2.64)

Patañjali :

अयुक्तोऽयं निर्देशः । प्रोक्तादिति भवितव्यम् । सौत्रो निर्देशः ।

In the Vyākaraṇādhikaraṇa[96] of the Tantravārtika Kumārila says:

सूत्रे तावत् 'जनिकर्तुः प्रकृतिः' (1-4-30) इत्यत्र हि द्वावपशब्दौ जनिशब्देन हि 'इक् श्तिपौ धातुनिर्देशे' इत्यनेन लक्षणेनान्वितो धातुरेव निर्दिश्यते । न च तस्य कर्तुः प्रकृतेरपादानसंज्ञेष्यते । जायमानस्य पुनरर्थस्य जनिशब्दो वाचकतया नैव लक्षणेनानुगतः । तेनायं दरिद्र इवाश्वशब्दो जनिमात्रवाचित्वात् तदर्थं प्रत्ययसाधुरेव विज्ञायते । तथा तृजकाभ्यां कर्तरि (2-2-5) इति प्रतिषिद्धषष्ठीसमासप्रयोगाद्व्याकरणफलपरित्यागः । एवं तत्प्रयोजक (1-7-55) इति प्रतिषिद्ध एव समासः ॥

3. Pāṇini's main intention in adopting such various devices as Its, Pratyāhāras, etc; is to secure economy in expression. We have also the Paribhāṣā : अर्धमात्रालाघवं पुत्रोत्सवं मन्यन्ते वैयाकरणाः । But the Mahābhāṣya on the following Sūtras says that in their case he has not been able to adhere to this maxim; according to Patañjali, each of them is either partly or wholly superfluous.

मुखनासिकावचनोऽनुनासिकः (P. 1.1.8)

Patañjali :

मुखग्रहणं शक्यमकर्तुम् । केनेदानीमुभयवचनानां भविष्यति । प्रासादवासिन्यायेन । तद्यथा केचित्प्रासादवासिनः, केचिद्भूमिवासिनः, केचिदुभयवासिनः । ये प्रासादवासिनो गृह्यन्ते ते प्रासादवासिग्रहणेन भूमिवासिग्रहणेन च ।

एवमिहापि केचिन्मुखवचनाः, केचिन्नासिकावचनाः, केचिदुभयवचनाः । तत्र ये मुखवचना गृह्यन्ते ते मुखग्रहणेन । ये नासिकावचना गृह्यन्त त नासिकाग्रहणेन । य उभयवचना गृह्यन्त एव ते मुखग्रहणेन नासिकाग्रहणेन च ॥

96. Adhikaraṇa 1.3.8.

See also the Mahābhāṣya on :—

P. 1.1.23; 1.1.25; 1.1.44; 1.1.48; 1.1.50; 1.2.45 1.2.59–60; 1.2.69; 1.2.73; 1.3.72; 1.4.108; 2.1.13; 2 3.30; 2.3.46; 3.1.58; 3.1.71; 3.1.93; 3.3.119; 3.4.32: 4.1.22; 4.2.11; 4.2.59; (See 4.2.67-70); 4.2.62; 4.2.96; 4.4.23; 5.1.3; 5.1.16; 5.4.70: 5.4.73; 6.1.2; 6.1.18; 6.1.39, 6.1.70; 6.1.72; 6.4.45; 6.4.127–128; 7.1.10; 7.1.11 7.1.56; 7.1.62; 7.2.89; 7.2.90; 7.3.31; 7.3.70; 8.1.74; 8.2.6; 8.2.38; 8.2.40; 8.2.46.

It must, however, be noted that in some instances this defect appears to us only when we judge the Aṣṭādhyāyī in accordance with the rules of interpretation laid down by Patañjali; it may not appear if Pāṇini is studied independently of Patañjali.

Occasional digressions

Introduction of a foreign matter into a different context has been mentioned by some scholars as one of Pāṇini's defects. "He[97] wanders in an intricate maze, and the key of the labyrinth is continually slipping from his hand", says Colebrooke. Wackernagel[98] also cannot "see anything in Pāṇini save the dim light of a rational plan and the deep night of historical chance, miserliness in words, love of ease, a breaking down of natural connections, the whole a whirlpool of caprice." But Faddegon points out that all digressions are associative digressions and that they cannot thus be said to be one of Pāṇini's defects. Under the caption "Main principles of Pāṇini's forms of literary composition", he says :

"The associative digression, which often interferes with the logic of division, can be either due to what precedes or to what follows, or it arises from the wish to link together two logically divided subjects. Sometimes, moreover, a section is not limited to the subject expected by the reader according to the context, but at the same time deals with subjects which in the author's mind are coherent with it.

97. See Herebert H. Gowen, A History of Indian Literature; P 151; Vide also Vaidya, History of Sanskrit Literature, Section III, P. 122; Macdonell, A Sanskrit Grammar for beginners, Introduction, P. 9.

98. Altindische Grammatik, p. 62.

As an example of preceding digression may be mentioned sū. 2,1,2, for whilst adhy. 2 pa. 1 and 2 treat in general of the compound, the sūtra mentioned gives the rule that a noun case dependent on a following vocative is considered with reference to accent to be as it were one word with this vocative.

As an example of following digression may be quoted 8,4,57, where unexpectedly a rule is given for final vowel in a context dealing with final consonants, mainly because of the anuvṛtti of vāvasāna which thus could be used.

The instances of concatenative digression are very numerous; see for instance passage 4,1,77-81, which forms part both of the section on denominative noun-derivation.

As an example of too wide discussion may be quoted 1,3,2-9, for, whilst the introductory sū. 1 3,1, dhātavaḥ and the total discussion of 1,3,12-fin, show that the main subject of the pada is the verb and its active and middle voice, yet the sutras 2-9 do not only give rules for the anubandhas of the Dhātupāṭha, but treat the anubandhas in general."

KĀTYĀYANA

CHAPTER I

The background of the Vārtikas

"The[1] universe is in a state of ceaseless change. You could not step twice into the same river, for other and yet other waters are ever flowing on", said Heraclitus. Even languages fortified by the most scopeful grammar cannot escape this inexorable process. And when numerous phonetic, semantic and syntactic changes carried the language beyond the reaches of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana whom the researches of Goldstucker have credited also with the authorship[2] of the Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya, set himself to writing the Vārtikas on the Aṣṭāydhāyī, which are in the form of supplements, emendations, refutations, explanations et hoc genus omne. Dr. Belvalker thinks that the suggestion of subjecting Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī to a searching criticism dawned upon him probably in the course of his Prātiśākhya.

It is true that some of his Vārtikas, which from some modern scholars have earned the remark that they are strictures on Pāṇini, are, from Patañjali's point of view, unnecessary; but taking his whole work into consideration, we cannot ignore the fact that he has spanned that gulf which yawned between the grammar of Pāṇini and the language of his time, which otherwise would have perhaps been left unbridged; and we are in need of no more justification to say that when the roll of those who have contributed to the history of Sanskrit comes to be called, his rank is sure to be deemed of great importance.

Though there had been many Vārtikakāras on Pāṇini, as we know through Patañjali's[3] quotations, Kātyāyana alone had the

1. Thilly, History of Philosophy, p. 23.
2. Vide Goldstucker, Pāṇini, p. 192 sqq; Belvalkar, Systems of Sanskrit Grammar, p. 29ff. This will be disproved later here.
3. In a number of cases where Kātyāyana gives first one view and then rejects it by giving another, we may infer that he is criticising some of his predecessors though he is not referring to

unique fortune of bequeathing to a distant grammatical posterity a work which was to survive and preserve the continuous chain of linguistic investigation in India.

Kātyāyana's position in respect to Pāṇini

Here it is proposed to examine the Vārtikas with a view to clarifying the position of their author in respect to Pāṇini and to pointing out their correlation to linguistic changes.

GOLDSTUCKER'S OPINION

Goldstucker in his[4] Pāṇini says :

"A Vārtika of Kātyāyana is therefore not a commentary which explains, but an animadversion which completes. In proposing to himself to write Vārtikas on Pāṇini, Kātyāyana did not mean to justify and defend the rules of Pāṇini, but to find fault with them and whoever has gone through his work must avow that he has done so to his heart's content. He will even have to admit that Kātyāyana has frequently failed in justice to Pāṇini, by twisting the words of the Sūtras into a sense which they need not have or by upbraiding Pāṇini with failings he was not guilty of. On this score he is not unfrequently rebuked by Patañjali, who on such occasions severely rates him for his ungenerous treatment of Pāṇini and, as we have seen in an instance above (p. 52), proves to him that he himself is wanting in proficiency and not Pāṇini. Kātyāyana, in short, does not leave the impression of an admirer or friend of Pāṇini, but that of an antagonist often, too, of an unfair antagonist. In consequence his remarks are attached to those Sūtras alone which are open to the censure of abstruseness or ambiguity and the contents of which were liable to being completed or modified : he is silent on those which do not admit of criticism or rebuke."

Following in the wake of Goldstuker, Dr. Belvalkar also says that Kātyāyana's object is not to explain Pāṇini but to find fault with his rules. He regards him as a follower of the Aindra school

them by name. I give a few examples illustrative of a host of others: P. 3.2.135, V. 3; P. 2.24, V. 16; P. 3.3.132, V. 2 and and 4; P. 6.1.7, V. 2; P. 6.1.17, V. 2.

4. P. 119-120.

which was to Burnell, the most ancient grammatical treasure-trove ever unearthed.

Untenability of this view

A closer study of the Vārtikas will show that there is no adequate reason to aim this slur at Kātyāyana. Conceding to a certain extent that a Vārtika of Kātyāyana is not a commentary which explains, it may be pointed out that a commentary on a grammatical work need not necessarily be only explanatory. The traditional definition of a Vārtika is

उक्तानुक्तदुरुक्तानां चिन्ता यत्र प्रवर्तते ।
तं ग्रन्थं वार्तिकं प्राहुर्वार्तिकज्ञा मनीषिणः ॥

(Chāyā, p. 2, N.S.Ed.)

and its object is quite different from that of ordinary commentary, viz, Vyākhyāna. Sāstraic Vyākhyānas are very often seen transcending the regions of mere explanations of texts. If we render 'Vārtika' into 'commentary' it does not convey the full sense of that term. To say that "a Vārtika of Kātyāyana is therefore not a commentary which explains but an animadversion which completes" is to ignore the bulk of exaplanatory Vārtikas trying to render Pāṇini clearer. In the following instances, Patañjali admits that Kātyāyana is actuated by a sincere motive of clearing all ambiguity for students and thereby acknowledges the indispensibilty of those Vārtikas.[5]

P.3.3. 127, V. 2. कर्तृग्रहणं चोपपदसंज्ञार्थम् ।

Patañjali : कर्तृकर्मग्रहणं चोपपदसंज्ञार्थं द्रष्टव्यम् ।
द्रष्ट्व्यं विजानीयादभिधेययोरिति ।
तदाचार्यः सुहृद्भूत्वान्वाचष्टे कर्तृकर्मग्रहणं चोपपदसंज्ञार्थमिति ॥

P. 4.3.4, V. 2. दिक्पूर्वपदाद्यच्च ।

Patañjali : इदमद्यापूर्वं क्रियतेऽर्धाद्यद्विधाने सपूर्वाट्ठञिति ।
तद्द्रष्ट्व्यं विजानीयात्सर्वमेव विकल्पत इति ।
तदाचार्यः सुहृद्भूत्वान्वाचष्टे दिक्पूर्वपदादर्धाद्यथान्यासमेव
भवतीति ॥

---

5. See also P. 2.4.32, *V*. 2; 2.4.69, V. 1; 3.1.21, V. 1; 3.1.44. V. 7; 4 3.143, V. 2; 5.3.8, V. 1; 6.1.30, V. 1; 6.1.90, V. 2-3; 7.1.89, V. 1, etc.. Vide Patañjali who on each of these says :
तस्मात्सुष्ठूच्यते etc.

P. 5. 1. 31, V. 1. द्वित्रिभ्यां द्वैयोग्यम् ।

Patañjali : द्वैष्यं विजानीयादविशेषेणेत उत्तरं द्वित्रिभ्यामिति ।
तदाचार्यः सुहृद्भूत्वान्वाचष्टे द्वित्रिभ्यां द्वैयोग्यमिति ॥

"In proposing to himself to write Vārtikas on Pāṇini" Kātyāyana's duty as commentator was not to justify or defend Pāṇini, but to introduce the necessary modifications in order to make Pāṇini keep abreast of later developments in the language. In fact, he could not defend Pāṇini even embarking on a process which would have involved a good deal of tampering with the text. If a commentator starts with the determined object of defending an author whose work is really in need of some changes necessitated by the lapse of time, the work turned out by him will nowise be critical; neither will it stand the test of time. A grammatical commentary especially has no value if it does not make the necessary changes in (improvements upon) its text. Let us turn towards Patañjali and see what he has done. Though his avowed object, according to the above view, is to exploit all avenues of possibilities to defend Pāṇini, he could not but refute[6] some of his Sūtras; he could not but add some supplements[7] and emendations[8]; he had to comment on a good number of Sūtras to make them clearer in their import; and besides all this, he had to resort to Yogavibhāga[9] in a number of instances.

Instances are no wanting to show that Kātyāyana has sometimes defended (i. e., tried to find the desired meaning from some rules without altering them) Pāṇini. The following are some among others.

---

6. See Patañjali on P. 1.1.29, 1.2.60-63, 1.2.69, 1.2.73, 1.4.25-31, 4.2 11, 4.2.96, 4.4 23, 5 1.3, 6.1.70, 6.1.72, 6.4.45, 7.1.56 and 7.3.31.
7. See Part III (Patañjali), Chapter II.
8. An emendation consists in the omission, addition, replacement etc. of a word or words; see Patañjali on P. 1.4.21-22. 4.1.22, 4.1.31; 4 1.75, 5.1.16, 5.4.73, 5.4.76, 6.1.130, 7.1.11, 7.1.62, 7.2.89, 7.2.90, 7.3.45, 7.3.70, 8.2.6, 8.4.28, etc. For more instances vide Part III (Patañjali), Chapter II.
9. For Yogavibhāgas see Patañjali on P. 1.1.30, 1.4.17, 2.3.17, 2.3.62, 2.3.71, 3.1.85, 5.1.24, 5.1.96, 5.2.40, 6.1.1, 6.2.42, 6.4.16, 6.4.51, 6.4.74, 6.4.134 (See 133) 6.4.140, 7.3.108, 7.4 60, 8.2.4, 8.2.40, 8.2.92, 8.3.37 and 8.4.26 (See 8.4.1).

P. 1. 1. 12, V. 8 न वा ग्रहणविशेषणत्वात् ।
P. 1. 2. 43, V. 3 न वा तादर्थ्यात्ताच्छब्द्यम् ।
P. 1. 3. 3, V. 5 एकशेषनिर्देशाद्वा ।
P. 3. 1. 46, V. 4 योगविभागात्सिद्धम्
P. 7. 1. 2, V. 2 न वा क्वचिच्चित्करणादुपदेशिवद्वचनानर्थक्यम् ।
P. 7. 1. 2, V. 5 प्रातिपदिकविज्ञानाच्च पाणिनेः सिद्धम् ।
P. 8. 2. 23, V. 6 योगविभागात्सिद्धम् ।[10]
P. 8. 4. 68, V. 5 एकशेषनिर्देशाद्वा स्वरभिन्नानां भगवतः पाणिनेः सिद्धम् ।

In a good many instances like these, Kātyāyana sees that he can avoid criticising, i. e., emending Pāṇini by adopting these devices (Yogavibhāga, etc). Like Patañjali, the Vārtikakāra also introduces several important maxims, e. g.:–

"सन्निपातलक्षणो विधिरनिमित्तं तद्विघातस्य,[11]
असिद्धं बहिरङ्गमन्तरङ्गे[12], उच्चार्यमाणः शब्दः[13]
संप्रत्यायकः न संप्रतीयमानः, तादर्थ्यात्ताच्छब्द्यम् ॥[14] etc.

all of which are essential for the regulation of the application of the Sūtras of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. Patañjali accepts these Nyāyas and uses them in a number of other instances. In short, the method[15] adopted by Patañjali in commenting on Pāṇini is used by Kātyāyana himself, the only difference between the two being that while the former uses it only in a limited number of instances, the latter does so to a very large extent. That Patañjali's object in adopting these devices is not so much to criticise Kātyāyana as to expand the scope of the Aṣṭādhyāyī may be known from the fact that he resorts to them even in the case of those Sūtras which are not touched upon by Kātyāyana. On P. 7. 4. 47

10. Yogavibhāga is also a defence of Pāṇini in so far as it tries to get the desired meaning from the Sūtra itself without introducing anything external as a supplement or emendation.
11. P. 1.1.39, V. ·.
12. P. 1.1.47, V. 7.
13. P. 1.1.68, V. 3.
14. P. 1.2.43, V. 3.
15. Finding the desired meaning in the Sūtras themselves by Yogavibhāga, Praśleṣa, etc,

Patañjali says that devices like Yogavibhāga, Praśleṣa, etc., do not amount to Sūtrabheda :

> नासौ सूत्रभेदः । सूत्रभेदं कमुपाचरन्ति ? यत्र तदेवान्यत्सूत्रं क्रियते भङ्गो वा ।
> यदि तदेवोपसंहृत्य क्रियते नासौ सूत्रभेदः ॥

It is doubtless true that the consummate scholarship of Patañjali has "obviated the punctiliousness of the Vārtikas and has proved to Kātyāyana that he himself is wanting in proficiency, not Pāṇini." But from this we cannot deduce that "Kātyāyana has frequently failed in justice to Pāṇini, by twisting the words of the Sūtras into a sense which they need not have, or by upbraiding Pāṇini with failings he was not guilty of." It can only show that Patañjali's method is more organic and his devices are more ingenious than those of Kātyāyana.

The stand-points of these two commentators are quite different. Kātyāyana as a rule introduces a modification which is per se external, whenever he finds a Sūtra insufficient. Patañjali first sees whether the Aṣṭādhyāyī can be so construed as to yield the requisite meaning and proceeds to supplement or emend it only after being convinced that it cannot. His object is to make the Aṣṭādhyāyī as comprehensive and elastic as possible and, as will be pointed out later, he has also succeeded in his object to a large extent. I take the instance given by Goldstucker himself and prove what I consider to be a fundamental difference between the view-points of these two great critics.

गोस्त्रियोरुपसर्जनस्य (P. 1. 2. 48) : When 'go' or a word which has its termination a feminine affix is regarded as Upasarjana, the final vowel of the Prātipadika ending with it is shortened.

Here Kātyāyana takes 'strī' to mean feminine words in general and in order to exclude tantrī, śrī, lakṣmī, etc. (Kṛt words ending with Uṇādi affixes) introduces this emendation : गोटाङ्ग्रहणं कृन्निवृत्त्यर्थम् । Patañjali assumes that the word 'strī' here is marked with Svarita which indicates that this term applies only to those feminine words which are formed by such affixes as have been enumerated under the Adhikāra स्त्रियाम् (P. 4-1-3). Uṇādi words are

thus excluded. This assumption is based on his three-fold interpretation of स्वरितेनाधिकार : (P. 1-3-11). In the Mahābhāṣya on that rule Patañjali observes as follows:—

> न तर्हीदानीमयं योगो वक्तव्यः । वक्तव्यश्च । किं प्रयोजनम् ? स्वरितेनाधिकारगतिर्यथा विज्ञायेत । अधिकं कार्यम् । अधिकः कारः । अधिकारगतिः— गोस्त्रियोरुपसर्जनस्येत्यत्र गोटाङ्ग्रहणं चोदितम् । तन्न कर्तव्यं भवति । स्त्रीग्रहणं स्वरयिष्यते । स्वरितेनाधिकारगतिर्भवतीति 'स्त्रियाम्' इत्येवं प्रकृत्य ये प्रत्यया विहितास्तेषां ग्रहणं विज्ञास्यते ।
> तत्र स्वरितेनाधिकारगतिर्भवतीति न दोषो भवतीति ।

He then goes on to illustrate 'अधिकं कार्यम्' and 'अधिकः कारः' Whether this triplicity of interpretation is intended by Pāṇini is a matter on which there may be disagreement. Kātyāyana however does not know that it is capable of this threefold interpretation; neither does he attempt at construing Pāṇini in such a way as would solve the difficulty. He thinks (what Nāgeśa says by way of a Pūrvapakṣāvataraṇikā to the Mahābhāṣya on P. 1-2-48) : स्वरितत्वे (P. 1-3.11) उत्तरत्रानुवृत्तिरेव[16] स्यान्नतु तदधिकारस्थलाभः and introduces the above emendation which is quite necessary and reasonable from his point of view.

Instances of this kind cannot prove that "Kātyāyana has upbraided Pāṇini with feelings he was not guily of". Patañjali's superb and unexampled scholarship has overshadowed Kātyāyana and we are apt to understand incorrectly the latter's position in respect of Pāṇini when we compare him with the former. In the third part (Patañjali) it will also be pointed out that Kātyāyana regards the Aṣṭādhyāyī as a Dharma Śāstra, the study of which, according to him, is attended by religious felicity.

The number ot the Kātyāyana Vārtikas

The fixing of the exact number of the Kātyāyana Vārtikas is a task beset with formidable difficulties. They are known to us only through Patañjali's quotations in the Mahābhāṣya; and as Patañjali quotes also the Vārtikas, the grammatical dicta and Paribhāṣās of many

---

16. Because that is the primary meaning of P. 1.3.11.

other grammarians who have commented upon the Aṣṭādhyāyī—not to speak of his own dicta, desiderata and Kārikās, and as research has not hitherto been able to recognise a distinct characteristic by which the Kātyāyana Vārtikas can be sifted and sorted from others, their exact number remains unsettled.[17] One of the writers has gone so far as to suggest that there have been two Vārtikakāras by the patronymns Kātya and Kātyāyana respectively. In the Prastāvikā to the[18] Word Index to Pāṇini's Sūtras, Pathak and Chitrao rightly observe :

> "परं तु कात्यायनस्य कानि वार्तिकानि कानि वा महाभाष्यप्रणेतुः पतञ्जले स्तथैव कानि वा सौनागभारद्वाजादीनां वचनानि एतन्निर्णेतुं नाद्यापि अल्पांशेनापि तर्कमन्तरा निश्चप्रचं साधनं दृश्यते । कीलहोर्नमहोदयेनापि एतदेव स्वकीये वार्तिकविषयके निबन्धे प्रतिपादितम् ।"

The appendix to Kasinatha's edition of the Siddhāntakaumadī gives 5032 as the number of the Vāritikas quoted in the Mahābhāṣya and adds 34 more as spoken by Kaiyaṭa and others. According to Kielhorn's[19] edition, the number of the Kātyāyana Vārtikas in each Pāda is as follows :—

Chapter	I	Pāda	1. 521	Chapter	V	Pāda	1. 113
,,	,,	,,	2. 192	,,	,,	,,	2. 93
,,	,,	,,	3. 147	,,	,,	,,	3. 83
,,	,,	,,	4. 191	,,	,,	,,	4. 48
,,	II	,,	1. 116	,,	VI	,,	2. 376
,,	,,	,,	2. 101	,,	,,	,,	2. 62
,,	,,	,,	3. 91	,,	,,	,,	3. 116
,,	,,	,,	4. 118	,,	,,	,,	4. 153
,,	III	,,	1. 277	,,	VII	,,	1. 122
,,	,,	,,	2. 153	,,	,,	,,	2. 95

17. See Journal of Oriental Research, Madras, 1923, pp. 25-33.
18. G. O. S. Class C, No. 2.
19. In the preface to his edition of the Mahābhāṣya, Vol. I. p. 8, he says : "I cannot hope that my attempt to reconstruct the work of Kātyāyana has in every particular been successful, and the list of corrections at the end of this volume will show that further considerations made me change my views in one or two instances.

Chapter III	Pāda	3.	116
,, ,,	,,	4.	67
,, IV	,,	1.	234
,, ,,	,,	2.	109
,, ,,	,,	3.	103
,, ,,	,,	4.	29
Chapter VII	Pāda	3.	94
,, ,,	,,	4.	53
,, VIII	,,	1.	81
,, ,,	,,	2.	113
,, ,,	,,	3.	60
,, ,,	,,	4.	56
Total			4,293

The division of the Vārtikas

The Vārtikas of Kātyāyana fall chiefly into four categories, viz., supplements, emendations, explanations and refutations. Each of these may again be divided into two classes, namely, historical and academic. Those Vārtikas which are correlated to linguistic changes may be called historical, and those that do not account for any linguistic changes, but are concerned only with such academic matters as Gauravalāghava, etc, may be called academic. The respective functions of these types of Vārtikas are, as implied by their etymologies, too well known to need any explanation here.

CHAPTER II

The correlation of the Vārtikas to linguistic changes

I propose to examine in this chapter certain representative Vārtikas with a view to clarifying further the position of the Vārtikakāra in respect of Pāṇini. In the brief compass of a chapter like this it is not possible to embark on a thorough analysis of the contents of all the Vārtikas. I, therefore, select only a few from each chapter mostly those to which some historical interest is attached. The points deducible from this cursory examination will be given at the end. I follow the order of the chapters.

P. 1.1.6, V. 1. The roots 'dīdhī' and 'vevī' become Vedic, i. e., obsolete in Kātyāyana's language.

P. 1.2.64, V. 22-23, In these Vārtikas Kātyāyana introduces us to two new types of Ekaśeṣa.

1. Ekaśeṣa of words of identical forms, but having different meanings. e.g.–
   अक्षश्च अक्षश्च अक्षश्च अक्षाः ।
2. Ekaśeṣa of synonyms of dissimilar forms, e. g.–
   वक्रदण्डश्च कुटिलदण्डश्च वक्रदण्डौ

Some Vārtikas in the third Pāda of the first chapter deal with the extension, restriction and prohibition of the Ātmanepada and Parasmaipada, which necessarily presuppose a good deal of interchanging between them.

P. 1.4.60, V. 1. The Vārtikakāra extends Gatisamāsa to 'kārikā' in order to have 'kārikākṛtya'[20] when compounded with kṛtvā. Pāṇini's language does not perhaps have 'Kārikākṛtya.'

V. 2. In the Vedic language 'punar' and 'cana' are included among Gatis. The object of this is to have the accent taught by P. 8.1.20 (गतिर्गतौ) in compounds[21] like punar-niṣkṛtaḥ[22] and that taught by P. 6.2.49 (गतिरनन्तरः) in compounds like cano-hitaḥ.[23]

---

20. According to P. 1.4.60, 2.2.18 and 7.1.37.
21. Both compounded with Kṛdanta words according to P. 2.2.18.
22. T.S.1.5.2.4.
23. R. V. 3.2.2, 7; 1.2; 9.75.1; 4.

Some Vārtikas in the first and second Pādas of the second chapter deal with some probably new types of compounds of which the important are exemplified by the following:—

P. 2.1 24, V. 1. Grāmagamī, grāmagāmī.
P. 2.1.31, V. 4. Māsāvaraḥ.
P. 2 1.36, V. 4. Brāhmaṇārtham.
P. 2.1 60, V. 3-4. Kṛtāpakṛtam, bhuktavibhuktam.
„ „ V. 5 Gatapratyāgatam. This class probably owes its existence to the influence of such older compounds as gatāgatam kṛtākṛtam etc. taught by P. 2.160.

P. 2.1.69, V. 8 Śākapārthivaḥ.
Vigraha : शाकभोजी पार्थिवः शाकपार्थिवः
P. 2.2.24, V. 14 Praparṇaḥ.
Vigraha : प्रपतितपर्णः प्रपर्णः
P. 2.2.24, V. 21 Astikṣīrā.
Vigraha : अस्ति चीरं यस्याः सा ।

Then there are some Vārtikas in this (second) Pāda which determine the position of certain words in Dvandva and other compounds. Besides the principle of economy of effort, such considerations as the relative importance, the natural order of succession, veneration, age, the established order of things or persons denoted, etc., play an important part in the arrangement of the words in the Dvandva compounds (P. 2.2.24, V. 2-9).

In Kāraka the following are some of those types of Prayogas in which the respective Vibhaktis are not accounted for by Pāṇini, but by Kātyāyana.

P. 2.3.2, V. 1. Samayā grāmam.
P. „ „ „ Nikaṣā grāmam.
„ „ „ Hā Devadattam.
P. 2.2.13, V. 1. Yūpaya Dāru.
P. 2.3.13, V. 2, Mūtraya kalpate yavāgūḥ.
„ V. 3. Vātāya kapilā vidyut.
„ V. 4. Hitam arocakine.
P. 2.3.18, V. 1. Prakṛtyā abhirūpaḥ.
P. 2.3.28, V. 2. Prāsādāt prekṣate.

P. 2.3.36, V. 1. Adhītī vyākraṇe.
P. 2.3.36, V. 2. Mātari sādhuḥ.
P. 2.3.52, V. 1. Mātuḥ Smaryate.
P. 2.3.36, V. 6. Carmaṇi dvīpinaṃ hanti.

There is a good deal of generalisation of the genitive case. The sphere of the Upapada Vibhakti is also widened. New meanings are attributed to case affixes.

In Patañjali's language this becomes so irregular that he has to say :

एकशतं षष्ठ्यर्थाः ॥[24]

[25]एवं तर्हि कर्मादीनामविवक्षा शेषः...........सतोऽप्यविवक्षा भवति, etc.

The use of the genitive case is thus liberalised by him to a greater extent.

P. 2. 4. 37, V. 1. According to the Sūtra, the root 'ad' is substituted by 'ghas' in Luṅ as well as when followed by San. The Vārtika says that this substitute should be had also when that root is followed by the Kṛt affix 'ac'.

P. 2. 4. 30, V. 2. In this Vārtika Kātyāyana points out that the compound daśagava (Dvigu) is neuter. This word is no doubt pre-Pāṇinian; but it may be remembered that in the Vedic language another form, viz., daśagva is also seen and that there is no restriction of genders.

Daśagvaḥ : R. V. 10. 62. 6.

Daśagvam: R. V. 8. 12. 2.

P. 3. 10, V. 1. A new class of denominatives is formed by the locatives, e. g., prāsādīyati kuṭyām (he lives in a hut as if in a palace). According to the Sūtra, the Ācārārthaka denominatives are formed only by accusatives in cases of comparison where the treatment is mutually human, e. g., putrīyati cchātram (he treats the pupil as his own son).

---

24. P. 1.1.49.
25. P. 2.3.50.

P. 3. 1. 11, V. 1-2. The elision of the final 's' which in Pāṇini's language is obligatory when a noun ends in 's' becomes optional in Kātyāyana's. This non-elision is later carried on further and further, and according to one commentator referred to by Patañjali, 'apsaras' is the only exception in the classical language.

Patañjali says :

> अपर आह । सलोपोऽप्सरस एव । पयस्यत इत्येव भवितव्यमिति । कथमोजायमानं योऽहिं जघानेति । छान्दसः प्रयोगश्छन्दसि दृष्ट-मनुविधीयते ।

We can recognise here four stages :–

1. Pāṇini's language; payāyate. Cf. also the Vedic example quoted by Patañjali.
2. Kātyāyana's language : payāyate and payasyate; both are perhaps equally popular.
3. Payasyate and payāyate; payasyate is perhaps more predominantly popular and it may even be said that in some places only payasyate is used to the exclusion of payāyate (Cf. सलोपोऽप्सरस एव).
4. Both are equally popular. Cf. ओजोऽप्सरसोर्नित्यम् (3.1.11, V.2)

P. 3.1.15, V. 1. The denominative of 'tapas' namely tapasyati which was once used either only in the Ātmanepada or in both the Padas takes only the Ātmanepada terminations in Kātyāyana's time. Patañjali gives an instance of its Ātmanepada - तपस्यते लोकजिगीषुरग्ने :– and disposes it off as Cchāndasa.

P. 3.1.22, V. 3. The intensive affix 'yaṅ' is added to ūrṇu (Adādi group) which is not, as required by Pāṇini, a monosyllabic root beginning with a consonant. In Patañjali's time we see the extension of 'yaṅ' to some other polysyllabic roots and also to roots which do not begin with a consonant, e.g., sūci, sūtri, aśi, etc. It is deserving of notice that after Pāṇini's time, ūrṇu comes to be treated more and more as a monosyllabic root. Kātyāyana, as we have seen above, allows 'yaṅ' to be added to it. He prohibits the periphrastic 'ām' also in Liṭ (P. 3.1.36, V.6). In the following Kārikā Patañjali says that for all purposes ūrṇu must be regarded as ṇu (i.e., monosyllabic).

वाच्य ऊर्णोर्णु वद्भावो यङ्प्रसिद्धिः प्रयोजनम् ।
आमश्च प्रतिषेधार्थमेकाचश्चेड्डुपग्रहात् ॥[26]

P. 3. 1. 26, V: 5. This Vārtika allows a new class of causatives to be formed in the sense 'to do', e. g., सूत्रं करोति सूत्रयति. Bhattoji[27] Dīkṣita takes this and the following Vārtikas on this Sūtra as Gaṇasūtras.

P. 3. 1. 26, V. 6. Another class of causatives is formed adding ṇic in the sense 'he recites that legend', etc., to words formed by Kṛt affixes and denoting a story; on the addition of ṇic, the Kṛt affix is elided and the base resumes its original form, e. g.,

कंसवधमाचष्टे कंसं घातयति[28] ।

P. 3. 1. 35, V. 1. The periphrastic ām is not an old phenomenon. It does not occur in Vedic words, e. g., कृष्णो नोनाव (R. V. 1. 79. 2). Pāṇini also says कास्प्रत्ययादाममन्त्रे लिटि (3. 1. 35). Its addition becomes obligatory in the Perfect of 'indh' in Kātyāyana's language, whereas in Pāṇini's it is either optionally used or is not used at all. On P. 1. 2. 6. (इन्धिभवतिभ्यां च) Kātyāyana and Patañjali say as follows :–

Kātyāyana :

इन्धेश्छन्दोविषयत्वाद्भुवो वुको नित्यत्वात् ताभ्यां किद्वचनानर्थक्यम् ।

Patañjali :

इन्धेश्छन्दोविषयो लिट् । न ह्यन्तरेण छन्द इन्धेरनन्तरो लिड् लभ्यः ।
आमा भाषायां भवितव्यम् ॥

But Pāṇini seems to have some instances without 'ām' in his Bhāṣā.

The sphere of the periphrastic 'ām' comes to be widened more and more after Pāṇini's time. In the Vārtika under discussion,

---

26. The prohibition of 'iṭ' by एकाच उपदेशेऽनुदात्तात् (P. 7.2.10), e. g., प्रोर्णुतः, प्रोर्णुतवान् ।
27. See Siddhānta Kaumudī on P. 7.4.97.
28. Vadh is a substitute of han.

Kātyāyana extends it to 'cakās', which, according to Pāṇinīyas, is an independent polysyllabic root, i. e., not a reduplicated form of 'kās'. This has two forms in the Aorist of ṇi, namely, acacakāsat and acīcakāsat. Kaiyaṭa gives a twofold interpretation of P. 7.4.93 to account for these two forms. The whole topic has been fully discussed by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita in his Siddhānta Kaumudī in which he says :

> चकास्त्यर्थापयत्यूर्णोत्यादौ नाङ्गं द्विरुच्यते ।[29]
> किं त्वस्यावयवः कश्चित् तस्मादेकाश्विदं द्वयम् ॥
> वस्तुतोऽङ्गस्यावयवो योऽभ्यास इति वर्णनात् ।
> ऊर्णो दीर्घोऽर्थापयतौ द्वयं स्यादिति मन्महे ॥
> चकास्तौ तूभयमिदं न स्यात्स्याच्च व्यवस्थया ॥

Pāṇini. 7. 4. 93 (सन्वल्लघुनि चङ्परेऽनग्लोपे) and 7. 4. 94 (दीर्घो लघोः) which (according to the first interpretation) relate only to monosyllabic roots are allowed by the second interpretation to take effect in the case of cakās, also a fact which indicates that it is really a reduplicated form of kās and that it is sometimes treated as such. This explains how 'ām' which Pāṇini teaches with reference to kās, (3.1.35) comes also to be added to cakās in Kātyāyana's time. But Kātyāyana who supplements P. 3. 1. 35 as above, regards it as an independent, i. e., primitive root. It may be noted that in Patañjali's language 'ām' is added to all polysyllabic roots. He emends P. 3. 1. 35 into कास्यनेकाजाममन्त्रे लिटि ।

P. 3. 1. 96, V. 1. The Vārtika gives a new affix. viz., kelimar to form pacelima, etc.

P. 3. 1. 100, V. 1. A new word, namely, ācarya is given. Pāṇini seems to have only ācārya.

P. 3. 2. 15, V. 1. Kātyāyana says that śaya is compounded with pārśva, etc., pārśvaśayaḥ. According to Pāṇini, śaya is compounded only with those words which denote real Adhikaraṇas, i. e., when the difference between the Ādheya and the Adhikaraṇa denoted by the other member of that compound is real and not otherwise, e. g., bhūmiśayaḥ. In pārśvaśaya, pārśva denotes only a mode of sleeping and not any Adhikaraṇa.

---

29. See on P. 7.4.94.

P. 3. 2. 48, V. 3. The word suga left out by Pāṇini and accounted for by Kātyāyana in this Vārtika occurs in the Vedic language (R. V. 1. 41. 4; 2. 27. 6; 3. 54. 21 etc.)

P. 3.2.49, V.1-3. Among the three words namely, dārvāghāṭaḥ, cārvāghātaḥ and varṇasaṅghātaḥ, explained by this Vārtika the first occurs in the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā 24. 35.

P. 3. 2. 60, V. 1. The words explained by this Vārtika are found also in the Saṃhitās.

Sadṛṅ : R.V. 1.94. 7; 8.11.8.
V.S. 17.81.
Anyādṛṅ : V.S. 17.81.
Sadṛśīḥ : R.V. 1.123.8; 3.35.3.
Sadṛkṣāsaḥ : V.S. 17.84.

P. 4.1.85, V. 2. This Vārtika gives two words, namely, pārthivā and pārthivī. Pāṇini does not say anything about this option. It is interesting to note that only the former occurs in the Saṃhitās.

Pārthivā : R. V. 1.64.3; 4 53.3; 5.8 7; 6 16.20; 6 45.20; 6.59.9: 9.14.8. etc.
S V. (उ) 4.2.3; 6.18.3.

It is doubtful whether Pāṇini has the latter form in his language.

P. 4.1.97, V. 1. We have, according to this Vārtika, one more form formed by akaṅ, namely, vaiyāsakiḥ. Patañjali gives four more, viz , vāruḍakiḥ, naiṣādakiḥ. cāṇḍālakiḥ and baimbakiḥ. He prefers to treat these words as indivisible, i. e., independent words not admitting of a grammatical analysis into Prakṛtis and Pratyayas. Says he ;

प्रकृत्यन्तराण्येवैतानि ।

P. 4.2.28, V. 2. Between the words śatarudrīya and śatarudriya explained by this Vārtika, it may be noted that the former is favoured more by the Taittirīya Saṃhitā and its Brāhmaṇa and the latter by the Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā and its Brāhmaṇa.

Śatarudrīya : T. S. 5.4.3.1; 3.3; 4.7; 5.9.
T. B. 3.11.10.3; 3.11.9.9.

Śatarudriya : V. S. 21.43; 44; 45.
Ś. V. 9.1.1.1; 2: 6: 7: 43; 44. 10.1.5.3; 2.4.15.
T. B. 3.6.11.2,

P. 4.1.85, V. 3. Both daivya and daiva given by this Vārtika are seen in the Vedic language.

Daivya :

R. V. 1.31.17
,, 44.6
,, 44.9
,, 44.10
,, 114.4
2.5.2 etc.
S. V. (उ) 3.17.1; 7.10.2; 8.3.3.
S. V. (पू) 4.1.7; 6.4.6
V. S. 12.111
S. B. 1.8.1.27.

Daiva : V. S. 34.1.
A. V. 20.135.1 3;5;7.12.1.; 4.16.8; 5.4.10.

P. 4.1.85, V.4. Bāhya, explained by this Vārtika, occurs in V. S. 25.2, A. V. 2.30.4 and 19.44.6.

P. 4.1.85, V. 8. This Vārtika says that the Taddhita affix in auḍulomi is elided in the plural and that on this elision it assumes its original form, namely, uḍulomāḥ. The elision of the Taddhita affix in the plural is due perhaps to the influence of words ending in Tadrāja affixes. Cf. P. 2.4.62.

तद्राजस्य बहुषु तेनैवास्त्रियाम् ।

P. 4.2.36, V. 5-6. Soḍha, dūsa, marīsaca and peja owe their existence in Sanskrit probably to Prākṛtic influence. Dūsa is evidently a corruption of dugdha. Dūd or dūda is still current in some languages like Hindi, Marāṭhi etc. Peja in a similar sense is still in vogue in Koṅkaṇī; but there is no restriction that it should be used only in combination with tila. Piñja occurs in the Atharvaveda.

Tilapiñjya : A. V. 2.8.3.
Tilpiñjya: A. V. 12.2.54.

P. 4.2.93, V. 1–2. Pāṇini enjoins the affix 'kha' to be added only to the compound avārapāra and to either of these words when employed separately; but Kātyāyana says that it is added also to avāra and pāra, when they are used separately as well as when compounded inversely.

Then there are some Vārtikas in this Prakaraṇa explaining a good number of Taddhita words among which the following may be mentioned.

P. 4.3.58, V. 1. Pārimukhyam: Pārihanavyaṃ.
P. 4.4.1, V. 1. Māśabdikaḥ.
P. 4.4.1, V. 2. Prābhutikaḥ.
P. 4.4.1, V. 3. Sausnātikaḥ; saukharātrikaḥ; saukhaśāyikaḥ.
P. 4.4.1, V. 4. Pāradārikaḥ; gaurutalpikaḥ.
P. 4.4.41, V. 1. Ādharmikaḥ.
P. 5.1.25, V. 1. Ardhikaḥ.
P. 5.1.25, V. 2. Kārṣāpaṇikaḥ. Prati becomes an optional substitute for kārṣāpaṇa, e. g., pratikaḥ.

P. 5.1.29, V. 1. Adhyardhasuvarṇaṃ; adhyardhasauvarṇikaṃ; adhyardhaśatamānaṃ; adhyardhaśātamānaṃ.
P. 5.1.71, V. 1. Yajñiyaḥ; ārtvijīnaṃ.

P. 5.1.77, V. 1-3. Pāṇini accounts only for auttarapathikaḥ; but Kātyāyana gives vāripathikaḥ, jāṅgalapathikaḥ, sthālapathikaḥ; kāntārapathikaḥ; ājapathikaḥ śaṅkupathikaḥ and sthālapatham. The last is used in reference to Marica.

P. 5.2.29, V. 1-2. The affix kaṭac is extended to alābu, tila and umā also in denoting the dust thereof.

P. 5.2 29, V. 3. Some actual nouns are given in this Vārtika as affixes, their meanings being generalised. When used separately, i. e., as independent words they denote only their primary meanings, e. g., goṣṭha (which means a cow-shed and not a sheepfold or any other paśusthāna). Thinking that these Taddhitas (gogoṣṭha, etc.) can be explained in a better way or perhaps criticising some of his predecessors who might have explained them as above, Kātyāyana next says : उपमानाद्वा सिद्धम्। With regard to taila used similarly as an affix in tilataila, iṅgudataila, etc., Patañjali makes this distinction :

प्रकृत्यन्तरं तैलशब्दो विकारे वर्तते ।
एवं च कृत्वा तिलतैलमित्यपि सिद्धं भवति ॥[30]

It must be noted that Patañjali here speaks only of that word which is used as an affix and not of the other which is used as an independent noun. The original meaning of the latter is gingili-oil; but in later Sanskrit it becomes a common name for all oils and Kaiyaṭa has to explain the above Mahābhāṣya as follows:—

व्युत्पत्त्युपाय एव तिलानां विकारस्तैलमिति । रूढिशब्दश्चायं स्नेहद्रव्यवृत्तिः । तथा च सादृश्यानुकरणमन्तरेणेङ्गुदतैलादयः शब्दाः प्रयुज्यन्ते । यथा प्रकृष्टो वीणायां प्रवीण इति व्युत्पत्तिमात्रं क्रियते कौशलं त्वस्य प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तम् । तेन वीणायां प्रवीण इत्यपि भवति ॥

P. 5.2.33, V. 2. Kātyāyana gives 'Cilla' and 'pilla'. Patañjali adds one more, namely, 'culla'.

P. 5.2.51, V. 1. Kātyāyana accounts for turya : चतुरश्छयतावाद्यक्षरलोपश्च. Perhaps Pāṇini does not know this form. The Saṃhitās have only the older one, namely, turīya which Pāṇini also seems to have in his language. Cf. R. V. 1.15.10; 1.164.45; 2.37.4; 8.3.24; 8.80.9; 9.96 19; 10.67.1; 4.45.1; 10.85.40.

V. S. 8.3; 27.20.
S. V. 5.1.3.
A. V. 10.10.29: 9.15.27; 20.91.1.

P. 5.2. 122, V, 2–11. We are here introduced by Kātyāyana to some new affixes. They are : ārakan, inac, cālu, eḷu, ūluc, and tap. Among the words formed with these terminations marutta and phalina occur in the Vedic language.

Marutta : Ait. Br. 8.21; S. Br. 13.5.4.6.
Phalina : A. V. 3.15.4.

P. 6.1.3, V. 2. This Vārtika says that the third of īrṣyati is reduplicated. It is not clear whether by 'third' Kātyāyana means the third syllable or the third consonant. Perhaps this ambiguity itself gives room for the option which we have when we come to Patañjali who says :

---

30. When used independently, i.e., uncompounded this word always means gingili-oil in Āyurveda.

केचित्तावदाहुरेकाच इति । ईर्ष्यिपिषति । अपर आह व्यञ्जनस्येति । ईर्ष्यियिषति ।

P. 6.1.3, V. 3. This Vārtika gives us kaṇḍūyiyiṣati, etc., (desiderative forms of certain denominative roots). Verbal forms of this kind in which terminations are piled on one another cannot have existed in Pāṇini's language which in Liebich's words, was "syntaktisch so gut wie identisch mit der sprache der Brāhmaṇas und Sūtras." The forms given by Kātyāyana here can, on the authority of this Vārtika which Patañjali does not reject, be reasonably supposed to have existed in his (Kātyāyana's) language. But one finds oneself at a loss to understand some later commentators who without observing any restriction go on adding termination after termination to verbal forms. For instance, in the Pratyayamālāprakaraṇa of the Siddhāntakaumudī Bhaṭṭoji gives even a quaternary derivative like bobhūyiṣayiṣati (यङ्सन्ण्यन्तात्सन्). The intensive of bhū is bobhūya; to this is added the desiderative 'sa'—bobhūyiṣa; from this a causative is derived—bobhūyiṣi; and from this again a desiderative—bobhūyiṣayiṣa. All this is nothing but a dry and insensible theorization. We can boldly say that if one were to explore the whole range over which words are used, namely, (to follow Patañjali)[31] the Earth with its seven continents, the three worlds, the four Vedas, with their Aṅgas and Upaniṣads in their various recensions, the one hundred branches of the Yajurveda, the Sāmaveda in its one thousand modes, the Ṛgveda in its twenty-one recensions and the Atharvaveda in nine, Vākovākya, the Epics, the Purāṇas, and the Vaidyaka, one would not be able to trace bobhūyiṣayiṣati anywhere else than in the works of these later grammarians. We will deal more fully with this subject later.

P. 6.1.3, V. 4. The reduplication of the third syllable is made optional by this Vārtika in the cases of the denominative roots. A further extension of this latitude is seen in the following Mahābhāṣya on this.

अपर आह यथेष्टं वा । यथेष्टं वा नामधातूनामिति । पुपुत्रीयिषति ।
पुतित्रीयिषति । पुत्रीयियिषति ।

S. C. Vasu[32] gives one more form, namely, पुत्रीयिषिषति, and adds: "Or there may be double and treble reduplication simultaneously as पुपुतित्रीयियिषति ।"

31. See the Mahābhāṣya, Vol. 1, p. 9.
32. Translation of the Siddhānta Kaumudī, Vol. 2, Part I, p. 607.

He does not give any authority for this. Patañjali, as we have just seen, approves only three forms.

Bhaṭṭoji clearly explains the above Mahābhāṣya as follows :-

आद्यानां[33] त्रयाणामन्यतमस्य द्वित्वमित्यर्थः । अजादेस्त्वाद्येतरस्य ।

P. 6.1.12, V. 5-7. Among the words explained by this Vārtika, namely, cakra, ciklida, cakrasa, carācara, calācala, patāpata, vadāvada, ghanāghana and pāṭūpaṭa, the last but one, i. e., ghanāghana occurs in the Saṃhitās.

R. V. 10.103.1.
V. S. 17.33.
A. V. 19.13.

The Vārtikas on the third Pāda of the sixth chapter give some Aluk Samāsas, i. e., compounds in which there is no elision of the case affix of the former member, which are not given by Pāṇini. Here are a few examples.

P. 6.3.1, V. 5.	Goṣu-cara.
P. 3.1, V. 6.	Varṣāsuja
P. 6.3.1, V. 7- 8.	Apsuyoni; apsavya; apsumati: apsuja; apsucara; gahvarestha.
P. 6.3.2, V. 1.	Brāhmaṇācchaṃsin. T. Br. 1.7.6.1. Śat. Br. 9.4.3.7.
P. 6.3.3, V. 1.	Añjasākṛta.
P. 6.3.3, V. 2.	Puṃsānuja; januṣāndha.
P. 6.3.5, V. 1.	Ātmanāpañcama: atmanādaśama.
P. 6.3.8, V. 1.	Ātmanebhāṣā; parasmaibhāṣā.
P. 6.3.9, V. 1.	Hṛdispṛk: divispṛk.
P. 6.3.11, V. 1.	Anteguru.
P. 6.3.21, V. 1.	Vāccyukti; diśodaṇḍa; paśyatohara.
P. 6.3.21, V. 2.	Āmuṣyāyaṇa; āmuṣyaputrikā.
P. 6.3.21, V. 3.	Devānāṃpriya
P. 6.3.21, V. 4-5.	Śunaḥśepa; śunaḥpuccha; śunolāṅgūla; divodāsa.

33. See the Siddhānta Kaumudī on this.

Among these Aluk Samāsas the following two are found in the Saṃhitās.

Śunaḥśepa : R. V. 1.24.12.13.
Divodāsa : S. V. (Pūrva) 5.1.2.
,, ,, (Uttara) 5.6.2.

P. 6.3.70, V. 1-9, etc. These Vārtikas teach the insertion of 'ṃ' in certain words of which two, namely, agnimindha and lokampraṇa, occur in the Vedic language.

Agnimindha : R. V. 1.162.5.
V. S. 25.28
Lokampraṇa : Śat.Br. 8.7.2.1; 8.5.4.8; 8.7.2.6; 8.7.2.7; 8.7.2.8; 8.7.2.2; 9.4.3.5; 10.4.2.18; 10.4.3.12; 10.5.4.5.

P. 6.3.109, V. 1-5.[34] In this Sūtra Pāṇini says that we have to accept on authoritative usage such compounds as pṛṣodara, gūḍhotma, etc. which embody irregular phonetic changes. Under this rule Kātyāyana adds the following words.

Dakṣiṇatāra (for dakṣiṇatīra); vāḍvali; Ṣoḍan; ṣoḍaśa; ṣoḍhā; ṣaḍdhā; dūḍāśa; dūṇāśa; dūḍabḥa; and dūḍhya.

We need concern ourselves here only with the last four to which attaches some interest. In the next Vārtika (6.3.109, V. 6) Kātyāyana says 'Chandasi.' It is therefore clear that according to him, the occurrence of these words is not confined to the Vedic langauge; but they are not found in the extant classical literature. Two of them, namely, dūḍhya and dūḍhabha occur in the Vedic language.

Dūḍhabha : V.S. 3.36.
Dūḍhya : S. V. (Pūrva) 2.2.7.

The Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya also has the rules उकारं दुद (3.42) and नाशे च (3.43). On the latter Uvvaṭa remarks :

मृग्यमुदाहरणम् ।

A note on the Pṛṣodarādi Gaṇa may be added. According to the Munitraya, the words entitled to be included in this Gaṇa are

34. Taranatha Tarkavacaspati's edition of the S. Kaumudī wrongly gives them as Gaṇa Sūtras. See. Vol. I. p. 427 (Cal. 1870)

compounds containing anomalous phonetic changes which are not explained otherwise; but later commentators who, whenever they find a word difficult to explain, put it in some Ākṛti Gaṇa, have made all sorts of additions to the Pṛṣodarādi group.

We have now in this Gaṇa such words as bṛsī, siṃha, haṃsa, etc. In the Siddhānta Kaumudī Bhaṭṭoji gives the etymology of bṛsī as follows :–

ब्रुवन्तो ऽस्यां सीदन्ति इति बृसी ।[35]

He gives a verse also in which siṃha, haṃsa, etc., are explained :–

भवेद्वर्णागमाद्धंसो सिंहो वर्णविपर्ययात् ।
गूढोत्मा वर्णविकृतेर्वर्णलोपात्पृषोदरम् ।।

This is really doing an injustice to Pāṇini who, as will be made clearer later, is an Avyutpattivādin. In fact, haṃsa is an Uṇādi[36] word. The other two words, namely, siṃha and bṛsī also deserve to be Uṇādis and not Pṛṣodarādis. Moreover, Patañjali does not refer to Varṇaviparyaya when on this Sūtra he remarks :

येषां लोपागमवर्णविकाराः श्रूयन्ते न चोच्यन्ते ।

It is not clear who is primarily responsible for these additions. In the Gaṇaratnamahodadhi Vardhamāna seeks to justify their inclusion in the Pṛṣodarādi class as follows :—

येषामुणादिशास्त्रेण व्युत्पत्तिर्न प्रकल्प्यते ।[37]
द्वित्रादिपदसंपर्कात्सा तेषां स्यान्निरुक्तितः ।।
समासशेषभूतं स्यान्निरुक्तपदसाधनम् ।
द्वित्रादिपदसंपर्काल्लोपागमविकारजम् ।।

उणादिशास्त्रे मयूरमहिषप्रभृतीनां व्युत्पादितानामपि पुनरत्र व्युत्पादन-मनेकधापि संज्ञाशब्दानां व्युत्पत्तिर्भवतीति प्रदर्शनार्थम् ।।

In his commentary[38] on the Siddhānta Kaumudī Taranatha Tarkavacaspati adds to this Gaṇa also the words explained in the Kārikā :

35. See P. 6.3.109.
36. III. 349.
37. 149.
38. Vol. I, p. 477 (Calcutta, 1870)

लुम्पेदवश्यमः कृत्ये तुम् काममनसोरपि ।
समो वा हिततयोर्मांसस्य पचि युज्घञोः ॥

The inclusion of these words among Pṛṣodarādis is against Vārtikas P. 6.1.144, 1–3 which explain them otherwise.

Similarly, in the Mayūrādi Gaṇa (P. 2. 1. 72) we have now such compounds as ehīḍa, snātvākālaka, niścapraca, jahijoḍa, etc. The example given by Pāṇini, namely, mayūravyaṃsaka illustrates only those compounds in which the positions of the Viśeṣaṇa and the Viśeṣya are inversed, e. g., chātravyaṃsaka, kāmbojamuṇḍa, etc; but, strangely enough, most of the compounds that we have in the present Mayūravyaṃsakādi are of a different type, having been included therein for different purposes. It is very doubtful whether they originally belonged to this Gaṇa.

It must also be noted that Pāṇini is a very systematic grammarian. To him Gaṇa means a group of words which, being covered usually by one Sūtra, can be subjected to a common treatment. The object of adopting the Gaṇas is only to secure brevity in the Sūtras. But in Vardhamāna's Gaṇaratnamahodadhi, which we now accept as our guide to the Gaṇas, we see a clear departure from the principles followed by Pāṇini. Words explained by different Sūtras and Vārtikas are often grouped together in this work into one class simply for the reason that they embody a common phenomenon. Instead of helping us to decide whether a Sūtra like कारस्करो वृक्षे (P.6.1. 156.), which some read in the Pāraskara Gaṇa, is a Gaṇa Sūtra or an Aṣṭādhyāyī Sūtra, Vardhamāna adds perplexity to confusion.

Cf. Gaṇaratnamahodadhi 150

पारस्करो देशविशेषवर्ती कारस्करो राजतरौ गिरौ च ।
नद्यां रथस्पा प्रमितौ तु किष्कुः प्रतिष्कशः प्रष्ठसहायदूते ॥

and ff. with Pāṇini 6. 1. 143 ff.

No other appendix to the Aṣṭādhyāyī seems to have undergone so many changes as the Gaṇapāṭha; expecially the Ākṛti Gaṇas. This is a subject in which no research worth the name has as yet been done. Each Gaṇa, if fully explored, will, I am sure, tell us its own story.

P. 7. 3. 45, V. 6. The word tārakā which Kātyāyana gives in this Vārtika occurs in both the Atharva Veda (5.17.4) and the Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā (24.10) in the meaning specified by him.

P. 7. 3. 45, V. 8. Kātyāyana says वर्तका शकुनौ प्राचाम् ।

The other form, namely, vartikā (meaning some bird) occurs in the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā (24.30; 24.20) which, as will be shown here in the third part, is probably his own Śākhā.

P. 7. 3. 45, V. 9. Aṣṭakā explained in this Vārtika is found in A. V. 15. 16. 2.

P. 7. 3. 45, V. 2. Kātyāyana says : पावकादीनां छन्दस्युपसंख्यानम् । Pāvaka : R. V. 3. 31. 20; 4. 51. 2; 7. 49. 2.

P. 7. 3. 45, V. 10. 'Ittva', i. e., the substitution of 'i' for 'a' of 'tap' becomes optional in sūtakā, putrakā and vṛndārakā in Kātyāyana's time. The Atharva Veda (8. 6. 19) has sūtikā. Probably forms with 'i' are older than those with 'a'.

P. 8. 1. 12, V. 3-12. Dvittva, i. e., repetition of words is allowed here by Pāṇini only in the case of Guṇavacanas which express Prakāra (Bheda or Sādṛśya), e. g., paṭuḥ paṭuh; but Kātyāyana allows it in the case of words which express Ānupūrvya, Cāpala, etc.

P. 8. 1. 15, V. 1. According to the Vārtikakāra, the term dvandva is employed also in reference to 'Atyantasahacarita' and 'Lokavijñāta, e. g. द्वन्द्वं स्कन्दविशाखौ । द्वन्द्वं नारदपर्वतौ ।

P. 8. 2. 17, V. 1-2. Kātyāyana accounts for the words rathītara and bhūridāvattara.

Rathītara : R. V. 6. 45. 15; 6. 56. 2; 6. 56. 3; 8. 45. 7; 8.61.12; 9. 66. 26.

S. V. (उ) 5. 11. 2
,, (पू) 3. 5. 1.
V. S. 12. 56; 15. 61; 17. 61.
Bhūridāvattara : R. V. 8. 5. 39.
Besides the above differences, the following may be noted.

P. 2. 2. 34, V. 2. Pāṇini : Paṭumṛduśuklāḥ.
Kātyāyana : Paṭumṛduśuklāḥ or Paṭuśuklamṛdavaḥ.

P. 2. 3. 69, V. 3. Pāṇini : Dāsīm Kāmukaḥ.
Kātyāyana : Dāsyāḥ kāmukaḥ.

P. 3.1.22, V, 6-7. Pāṇini : Kuṭilam krāmati and carīkramyate (intensive) are convertible.

Kātyāyana : They are not convertible.

P. 3. 1. 118, V. 1.

Pāṇini : Pratigṛhya and apigṛhya occur in Chandas as well as in Bhāṣā.

Kātyāyana : Their use is confined to Chandas, the forms employed in Bhāṣā being pratigrāhya and apigrāhya.

P. 3. 1. 124, V. 1-3.

Pāṇini : Pāṇisṛjyā; samavasṛjyā; apalapyam, avadabhyam.

Kātyāyana : Pāṇisargyā; samavasargyā; apalāpyam; avadābhyam.

P. 4. 1. 36.

Pāṇini : Pūtakratāyī, etc., even in the absence of Puṃyoga.

Kātyāyana : These are correct only when there is Puṃyoga, not otherwise.

P. 4. 1. 49, V. 4.

Pāṇini : There is only Upādhyāyi.

Kātyāyana : There is also Upādhyāyanī in the same sense.

P. 4. 1. 49, V. 7.

Pāṇini : There are only kṣatriyā and āryā. Both occur in the R. V.

Kṣatriyā : R. V. 8. 25. 8; 7. 64. 2.

Āryā : R. V. 4. 30. 18; 6. 33. 3; 9. 63. 14; 10. 65. 11.

Kātyāyana : Also āryāṇī and kṣatriyāṇī.

P. 4. 1. 39, V. 1.

Pāṇini : Asiknī and paliknī. Occur in the R. V.

Asiknī : R. V. 7. 5. 3.

Paliknī : R. V. 5. 2. 4.

Kātyāyana; only asitā and palitā in Bhāṣā.

P. 4. 1. 39, V. 3.

Pāṇini : Piśaṅgā. Occurs in R. V. 10. 136. 2.

Kātyāyana : Both piśaṅgā and piśaṅgī.

Conclusions.

Now, the conclusions that we can draw from the foregoing examination of the representative Vārtikas are these :—

1. The reasons which make Kātyāyana write the Vārtikas on the Aṣṭādhyāyī are the same as those which make Patañjali write the Mahābhāṣya on it, nemely, historical and academic; it is not his intention to point out Pāṇini's shortcomings. But the method adopted by him in supplementing Pāṇini's work is quite different from that adopted by the masterly genius Patañjali whose critical acumen overshadows the Vārtikakāra to a great extent; and it is this difference in method that has not been understood correctly by some who have not looked below the surface. If Kātyāyana is studied independently of Patañjali , not a single Vārtika would be regarded either as superfluous or as hunting up for Pāṇini's faults.

2. Sanskrit had undergone tremendous changes in the intervals, which must have been sufficiently long, between the composition of the Aṣṭādhyāyī and of the Vārtikas; such changes do not usually occur in a language which is not spoken;[39] for we know that the vocabulary of Sanskrit has undergone little change after it ceased to be a spoken language, i. e., probably from some time after Patañjali. It must be noted that like Pāṇini, Kātyāyana also refers to Bhāṣā, e. g., भाषायां शासियुधिदृशिधृषिभ्यो युच् (P. 3. 3. 130, V. 1).

---

39. T. W. Rhys Davids thinks that Sanskrit was not a spoken language in this period. See Budhist Indla, pp. 134 ff; vide Franke, Pali and Sanskrit, Strassburg (1902); Cf. Pathak, Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol.XI (1929), pp. 59ff; Kieth, History of Sanskrit Literature, Preface, pp. 26.-27; Winternitz, History of Indian Literature, pp. 44 and 512.

Pāṇini could not have ignored such a large number of words if they existed in his language; for I believe with the late Sir R.G. Bhandarkar[40] that though not absolutely infallible, Pāṇini is certainly not an indifferent grammarian so far as the Bhāṣā of his time is concerned. The only reasonable conclusion is that Sanskrit, being the spoken language in this period, had undergone numerous changes.

Pathak[41] is inclined to believe that Sanskrit preserved its accent till Kumārila's time; but the evidence adduced by him in support of his view is not satisfactory. Neither Kātyāyana nor Patañjali throws any light on this problem, all their discussions relating to accent being only of a theoretical nature. There are a number of Vārtikas in the 6th chapter of the Aṣṭādhyāyī dealing with accent. Both Kātyāyana and Patañjali have in this chapter very often the remark स्वरदोष: स्यात् ।

Here are a few examples :

P. 6.1.108, V. 8. स्वरदोषस्तु ।

P. 6.1.123, V. 1. अवङादेशे हि स्वरदोषः ।

P. 6.1.135, V. 12. अभक्ते स्वरः ।

P. 6.3.78, V. 2. सादेशे हि स्वरे दोषः ।

In instances of this type, both Kātyāyana and Patañjali point out that if the rule in question is misconstrued in such and such a way, it would affect the accent of the word concerned. This clearly shows a conservative spirit in preserving what in their Bhāṣā was a mere theoritical or grammatical entity and not a living reality. The term 'doṣa' here, as in the Dharmaśāstra, means deviation from a practice established by tradition and authority. Vārtikas and Patañjali's statements of this kind indicate that accent in their Bhāṣā had only a theoretical existence: it was only of academic interest. They do not help us to answer the question—was the Bhāṣā of their times accented ? On the other hand, the development of the Bhāṣikasvara in certain branches of Vedic literature, which

40. See Collected Works, Vol. 4, p. 272.
41. Annals of the Bhandarkar O.R.I., Vol. XI, pp. 59ff.

as evidence stands at present, was undoubtedly post-Pāṇinian, points out that accent after Pāṇini's time was fast on its decadence, and is therefore likely to go against Pathak's conclusion. This is a subject which has not as yet received the attention that it deserves from philologists. The Bhāṣikasvara is an accent resulting from the levelling down of the Udātta and the levelling up of the Anudātta. Here we have the beginning of a process which gradually seeks to do away with these differences in pitch. The etymology of the word suggests that this accent had its origin in Bhāṣā or spoken language. In a verse quoted by Ananta Bhaṭṭa at the end of his commentary on the Bhāṣikasūtra, it is defined as follows :-

उदात्तः स्वर्यते नीचो नीच उच्चस्वरो भवेत् ।[42]
ब्राह्मणस्य स्वरो ह्येष ज्ञायते वेदपारगैः ॥

In Kātyāyana's Bhāṣikapariśiṣṭasūtra also we have :

उदात्तानुदात्तौ भाषिकस्तत्सन्धिः ।[43]

The [44]Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra and its commentary also say that this is the Svara of the Brāhmaṇas—at least of that belonging to their Śākhā.

It is, therefore, impossible to believe that Sanskrit preserved its accent until Kumārila's time; for we see that the Bhāṣikasvara had in the time of the Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra already made its appearance even in some Brāhmaṇas. The Bhāṣikasvara, as has already been pointed out, was a slow but sure attempt to get freed from the Udātta and the Anudātta.

3. Pāṇini omits a large number of Vedic words not only those occurring in the Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā and the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, which are regarded by some as post-Pāṇinian, but also those occurring in the Ṛg-Veda and the Sāmaveda. This can be explained only in two ways: either he concentrates his attention

42. See his commentory.
43. See Bhāṣikapariśiṣṭasūtra.
44. I. 8. 17. Weber's ed.

only on the spoken language of his time and does[45] not care much for the Vedic language or they (Vedic words) escape his notice. In either case it is proved beyond doubt that Kātyāyana is a greater Vedic scholar than Pāṇini and that he comes to emend the Aṣṭādhyāyī only after he has exhausted the Vedic literature existing in his time. There is no evidence to believe that Pāṇini intends his work to be a Vedāṅga text. All these points will be made clearer later here.

---

45. Cf. S. Levi, Memoires de la Societe de Linguistique de Paris, 14, p. 278; Thieme, Pāṇini and the Veda, Introduction, p. 13; Willman Grabowska, Les Composes Nominaux, Dans Le Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, Introduction, p. 12.
But see Pathak, Annals of the Bhandarkar O. R. I., Vol. IX, pp. 84 ff.

CHAPTER III

Pāṇini's Sanskrit

Having pointed out above that the language taught by Pāṇini had undergone tremendous changes during the interval between himself and Kātyāyana we are now confronted with the very pertinent question—at what stage Pāṇini took up the language and stystematised it into his grammar ? A definite answer to this question can be given only when the date of Pāṇini with which this is inseparably bound up, is settled; but his date is unhappily uncertain. Still a diligent student of Pāṇini can draw certain inferences from the linguistic material dealt with in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. Attempts have already been made by eminent scholars in this direction. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar[46] thinks that Pāṇini's Sanskrit must be identified with that which preceded the Epics. According to Liebich,[47] it does not differ much from the language of the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras. A similar view is expressed also by Winternitz[48].

But the Brāhmaṇa period is a very broad[49] one and the language of one Brāhmaṇa shows important differences from that of another. Hence a broad boundary like the Brāhmaṇa period does not help us much in deciding the exact nature of Pāṇini's language. We have, therefore, to see which Brāhmaṇa or Āraṇyaka makes the closest approach to the Sanskrit taught by Pāṇini. The Aitareya[50] and the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇas get their language removed far from that of Pāṇini by their crude and wreckless etymologies and the large number of archaisms which they contain. The language of the Tāṇḍya and the Ṣaḍviṃśa is also not so refined as that taught in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. As regards the Śatapatha there is evidence to believe that its language differs from Pāṇini's. We have already

---

46. Collected Works, Vol. IV, p. 273
47. Pāṇini, Viertes Kapitel, p. 47.
48. History of Indian literature, p. 4?.
49. Vide Bloomfield. Atharvaveda, p. 3.
50. See Liebich, Pāṇini, p. 37.

seen that the word lokamprana, which occurs a number of times in this Brāhmaṇa, has not been accounted for by Pāṇini. There are also a fairly large number of non-Pāṇinian words in it. The language of the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka which contains a large number of archaisms is undoubtedly ante-Pāṇinian. Though the number of non-Pāṇinian words is almost negligible in the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, its etymological vagaries do not suggest that it belongs to a period of advanced linguistic speculations. The language of the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, though not much different from Pāṇini's, cannot exactly be that. There are also some non-Pāṇinian words in this Brāhmaṇa. As regards the Gopatha, all are agreed that it is much later than Pāṇini. In my opinion, it is the language of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka that makes the closest approach to Pāṇini's Sanskrit. It is almost free from archaisms. It also contains ample evidence for the highly advanced nature of the grammatical[51] speculations of its time.

51. See Chapters 7-8. It is deserving of notice here that Pāṇini accounts for 'hasti-varcasa' (P. 5.4.78) which occurs thrice in the first section of the 12th Chapter of this Āraṇyaka. Except one instance, namely, A.V. 3.22.1, this word does not occur anywhere in the rest of the Vedic literature.

PATAÑJALI

CHAPTER I

The Mahābhāṣya :-Its unique place among the commentaries on the Aṣṭādhyāyī :-

Among the large number of commentaries on the Aṣṭādhyāyī none excels Patañjali's effort in the sureness of the critical touch and in the unimpeachability of the authority. Written in a language which is rendered almost unique by the combination of simplicity and vigour and consisting mainly of dialogues which impart to it an absorbing interest, saving it from the dryness that usually characterises a Śāstraic commentry, the Mahābhāṣya stands out from the rest of its kind, deserving richly the esteem in which it has always been held as the great commentary. An important feature of the work is that it explains many rigid and recondite Śāstraic rules in terms of maxims derived from everday life, which makes it higher and wider than a Śāstraic commentary and enables it to throw a flood of light on the religious, social and other various aspects of contemporary life. All these excellences entitle it to the first place in the Hindu grammatical literature, as bringing out best their analytical acumen. Rightly goes the saying among the Paṇḍits :

महाभाष्यं वा पठनीयं, महाराज्यं वा पालनीयम् ।

'Either read the Mahābhāṣya or rule a large kingdom'.

Patañjali's genius has, as we have observed in the second part (Kātyāyana), overshadowed that of Kātyāyana and attracted a greater measure of reverence from all the later commentators. The classical language since his days has witnessed the palmy days of the beautiful Sanskrit poetry, has passed through the wearisome labyrinth of the later Śāstraic discourses (especially the Nyāya works) and is approaching a stage at which, we can say with reservation and caution, its structure is in danger of being Vernacularised. In spite of all this, Patañjali is even today the authority par excellence on grammatical questions.

The background of the Mahābhāṣya

The language had undergone various internal and external changes in the time of Patañjali. There was a greater influx of corrupt words than in the time of Kātyāyana, which paved the path for later dialects. There was the necessity, on the one hand, of guarding vigilantly against the repercussion of this tendency to disregard the rules of grammar, on any aspect of the Vedic pronunciation which had been handed down from generation to generation and preserved jealously intact with reverential care, and on the other, of bringing all the later linguistic developments within the scope of the authoritative[1] grammar and checking the further inrush of corrupt words to the extent possible.

Serious study of grammar had already begun, even in the time of Kātyāyana, to lose its charm and interest to the majority of students who after finishing there compulsory Vedic studies, hastened to the work-a-day world saying :

वेदान्नो वैदिकाः शब्दाः सिद्धा लोकाच्च लौकिकाः ।

'We have known the Vedic words from the Vedas and the spoken words from the common (empirical) speech and there is thus no need for Vyākaraṇa.

Hence the first question which Kātyāyana and Patañjali were called upon to answer was regarding the objects of the study of Vyākaraṇa. In the introductions to their respective works, we see both Kātyāyana and Patañjali explaining these purposes calling for a sound knowledge of grammar, the latter doing it very ably and convincingly with various instances.

If we take Kātyāyana's first Vārtika in its primary sense, he seems to regard Vyākaraṇa as a Dharma Śāstra. His opinion is embodied in the following introductory Vārtikas.

(१) सिद्धे शब्दार्थसंबन्धे लोकतोऽर्थप्रयुक्ते शब्दप्रयोगे शास्त्रेण धर्मनियमो यथा लौकिकवैदिकेषु ॥ [1]

तत्र वेदाङ्गत्वादेतद्व्याकरणाध्ययनपूर्वकप्रयोग एव धर्म इति प्रामाणिकाः ॥
Udyota, Vol. I, p. 67, N. S. ed.

'While common speech teaches us about words used with a view to meaning, their meanings and the mutual relations of these two, it is the distinctive function of grammar to restrict speech to correct words (as distinguished from Apaśabdas), such restriction (like many Laukika and Vaidika one), always being fruitful of reward.

[2]इदानीं वार्तिककारः शास्त्रस्य नियमविधिरूपतया सार्थक्यमाह सिद्धे शब्दार्थ-........................। लोकादेव हि प्रथमव्युत्पत्तिः। ततश्च लोकादेव शब्दे अर्थे तयोः संबन्धे च सिद्धे अर्थबोधनायशब्दप्रयोगेऽपि प्रसक्ते गवादय एव प्रयोक्तव्या न तु गव्यादय इति निमार्थं शास्त्रम्। नियमफलं तु धर्मः ॥

One difficulty which this generalisation offers is that it does not cover words which are not in use and whose meanings therefore cannot be learnt from speech. Kātyāyana says that this difficulty is unreal as no word can be said to be not in use so long as the object which it denotes continues to exist:

(२) अस्त्यप्रयुक्त इति चेन्नार्थे शब्दप्रयोगात्।

When the objector (Pūrvapakṣavādin) points out to the Vārtikakāra that words can fall out of use since it is possible for synonyms and convertible terms to elbow them out of use (3) अप्रयोगः प्रयोगान्यत्वात्,

he says (4) अप्रयुक्ते दीर्घसत्रवत्,

i.e., grammar as a science has to take these words also into account even as ritualistic science includes obsolete rituals within its treatment. The range and variety of language are such that unless we exhaust the whole of it, it is sheer folly to brand one word as obsolete and another as not.

(5) सर्वे देशान्तरे।

Patañjali :

महान् हि शब्दस्य प्रयोगविषयः। सप्तद्वीपा वसुमती त्रयो लोकाश्चत्वारो वेदाः साङ्गाः सरहस्या वहुधा विभिन्ना एकशतमध्वर्युशाखाः सहस्रवर्त्मा

2. Śabdakaustubha, Vol. I, p. 29.

सामवेद एकविंशतिधा बाह्वृच्यं नवधाथर्वणो वेदो वाकोवाक्यमितिहासः पुराणं वैद्यकमित्येतावाञ्शब्दस्य प्रयोगविषयः। एतावन्तं शब्दस्य प्रयोग-विषयमननुनिशम्यसन्त्यप्रयुक्ता इति वचनं केवलं साहसमात्रम् ॥

Kātyāyana then questions whether it is the knowledge of Śabdas or their use that brings us its reward and points out the fallacy in either of the two cases when they are taken individually.

If it is the knowledge of Śabdas that leads to 'Dharma' it has the danger of leading us equally far or even further[3] to its opposite (the Adharma), as a knowledge of Śabdas is impossible without the knowledge of Apaśabdas which is invariably incidental to it.

No doubt the second alternative is in accordance with the Śruti - तेऽसुरा हेलयो हेलय इति कुर्वन्तः पराबभूवुः (i. e. the Asuras who said हेलयः instead of हेरयः lost the battle), which enjoins restriction in the use of words (7) (आचारे नियमः) and not in the knowledge of them. But it involves the absurdity of the whole world being led to merit.

(8) [4]प्रयोगे सर्वलोकस्य

Kātyāyana therefore strikes a golden mean (9) शास्त्रपूर्वके प्रयोगेऽभ्युदयस्तत्तुल्यं वेदशब्देन ।

The employment of Śabdas with and according to Śāstraic knowledge (of Pratyaya and Prakṛti) brings merit, as does the study of Vedic Śabdas or the performance of rituals enjoined by them (Vedic Śabdas).

वेदः शब्दो यस्यार्थस्य स वेदशब्दस्तस्य यथा ज्ञात्वानुष्ठानं तथा शब्दानामपि प्रकृत्यादिविभागज्ञानपूर्वकः प्रयोग इत्यर्थः ॥

(Kaiyaṭa.)

---

3. अथवा भूयानधर्मः प्राप्नोति। भूयांसोऽपशब्दाः अल्पीयांसः शब्दाः। एकैकस्य शब्दस्य बहवोऽपभ्रंशाः। तद्यथा—गौरित्यस्य गावी गोणी गोपोतलिके-त्येवमादयोऽपभ्रंशाः ॥
(Patañjali on V. 6.)

4. Patañjali good-humouredly asks Kātyāyana why he is jealous of the whole world being led to merit:
कश्चेदानीं भवतो मत्सरो यदि सर्वो लोकोऽभ्युदयेन युज्येत ?

The argument advanced by Kātyāyana in discarding the first alternative involves a difficulty. In the domain of Dharma it is the written word (here the revealed one, i.e., Śruti[5]) that receives and deserves primary consideration and not the inference[6] that may be drawn from it. Verbal (especially scriptural) testimony is the first and the foremost means of knowledge (Pramāṇa) for the Vaiyyākaraṇas, and it cannot be on a par with inference which is less valuable to them. Moreover, a knowledge of Śabdas may not invariably be accompanied by a knowledge of Apaśabdas of the same nature and degree of reality, and logic may not grant this claim of Kātyāyana. Even the incidental knowledge of Apaśabdas of a very general kind (it being only what is not a Śabda is an Apaśabda), which is sought to be established as an invariable concomitant of Śabdha jñāna, depends upon the latter for its very sustenance and thus cannot disturb the value of its own subsistence (Upajīvya) and locus standi.

Kātyāyana thus earns an intelligent snub from Patañjali who holds quite a different view regarding Apaśabdas and turns down the contra-positive suggested by Kātyāyana.

Says he :

नैष दोषः । शब्दप्रमाणका वयम् । यच्छब्द आह तदस्माकं प्रमाणम् । शब्दश्च शब्दज्ञाने धर्ममाह ।

नापशब्दज्ञाने ऽधर्मम् । यच्च पुनरशिष्टाप्रतिषिद्धं नैव तद्दोषाय । तद्यथा—हिक्कितहसितकण्डूयितानि नैव दोषाय भवन्ति नाभ्युदयाय ॥

(Vol. I, p. 11. Kielhorn's Ed.)

Patañjali accepts the first alternative ज्ञाने धर्मः and clears the objections raised against it.

---

5. एकः शब्दः सम्यग्ज्ञातः शास्त्रान्वितः सुप्रयुक्तः स्वर्गे लोके कामधुग्भवति ॥
See Kaiyaṭa, Vol. I., p. 65 N. S. ed.

6. तथा धर्मजनकज्ञानविपरीतत्वात् तद्विपरीतजनकत्वेनापशब्दज्ञानादधर्मप्राप्तिः ॥
Udyota, Vol. I., p. 66 N. S. ed.

अथवा पुनरस्तु ज्ञान एव धर्म इति ।

The Śurti-एकः शब्दः सम्यग्ज्ञातः etc., says only that the knowledge of Śabdas leads to Dharma. It does not condemn the knowledge of Apaśabdas as sinful. An action like sobbing, laughing or scratching which is neither ordained nor prohibited by the Śāstra, leads neither to Abhyudaya nor to Adharma. Or, the knowledge of Apaśabdas is only a necessary means of attaining the knowledge of Śabdas and not an end in itself. It is an auxiliary to the main, i.e., Śabdajñāna and cannot[7] possess an object independent of that of the main; and when the Śruti says शब्दज्ञाने धर्मः, by Śabdajñāna it means the knowledge of Śabdas acquired through the necessary precedent, namely, the knowledge of Apaśabdas which have to be eliminated from the former.

Even[8] granting for argument's sake that the knowledge of Apaśabdas, though incidental and auxiliary to the main, is fraught with its own Adharma, he who knows Śabdas suffers naught, as the Adharma will be washed away in the end by the Dharma which is the main purpose and goal. He who knows the Śabdas is like him who whilst sinking a well acquires mud and mire on his body which he later washes clean in the pure water obtained in the end.

A similar topic is discussed by Patañjali under –

यस्तु प्रयुङ्क्ते कुशलो विशेषे शब्दान्यथावद्व्यवहारकाले ।
सोऽनन्तमाप्नोति जयं परत्र वाग्योगविद्दुष्यति चापशब्दैः ॥

(Vol. I., p. 2)

---

7. Cf. The Nyāya:
यदैकस्मादपूर्वं तदितरत्तदर्थम्
and Kumārila Tantra Vārtika (See Udyota, p. 65)
सम्बन्धयोश्च धर्मत्वं यदैकस्यावधार्यते ।
तदेतरत्तदर्थत्वान्न धर्मत्वेन गम्यते ॥
P. 196, Ben. Sans. Series. Adhi (1.3.8)

8. तुष्यतु दुर्जन इति न्यायेनापशब्दज्ञानस्य विपरीतत्वमात्रेणाधर्मसाधनत्वमभ्युपगम्यापि भाष्ये समाध्यन्तरमाह ।
Udyota, Vol. I, p. 68.

where he concludes that it is the ignorant that sin knowing only Apaśabdas and not the others who seek protection under knowledge.

Cf विज्ञानं तस्य शरणम् ।

The Udyota on this informs us that tradition ascribes this verse to Kātyāyana. As regards the Vārtika आचारे नियमः Patañjali says that the Vedic restriction न म्लेच्छितवै etc., which is given in a ritualistic context is confined to religious or sacrifical occasions and does not apply to secular speech. In this connection, Patañjali quotes[9] a Vedic legend in which two learned Ṛṣis are reported to have said यर्वाणस्तर्वाणः instead of यद्वानस्तद्वानः while they were not engaged in sacrificial performances. They thereafter came to be known as Yarvāṇastarvāṇas. Bhoṭṭoji Dīkṣita in his Śabdakaustubha[10] summarises Patañjali's view as follows :-

तत्रेदं भाष्ये सिद्धान्तितम् । याज्ञे कर्मण्येवायम् । न म्लेच्छित वा इत्यस्य क्रतुप्रकरणे पाठात् । क्रतुप्रयोगाद्बहिस्तु अपशब्दं प्रयुञ्जानो न दुष्यति ।

In the following statement of Prof. Chakravarti,[11] Patañjali must be understood as giving the view of Kātyāyana and not his own. "Though the correct Sanskrit forms, says Patañjali, as well as the corrupt words are equally expressive of sense, it is only the correct ones that are attended with religious felicity."

From this we conclude that Patañjali who allows Apaśabdas in secular utterance is a shade more tolerant than Kātyāyana towards them. This, then, is the most important difference in view between the two, which we will do well to remember. This comparison does not in any way belittle the magnificent achievements of Kātyāyana whom linguistic history will undoubtedly record as the greatest grammarian between Pāṇini and Patañjali. The difference is due probably to the centuries which part Kātyāyana from Patañjali and which witnessed a lowering of orthodoxy's colours.

9. P. 11.
10. P. 35.
11. Philosophy of Grammar, P. 35.

In giving the objects of Śabdānuśāsana Patañjali concerns himself mainly with the Vedas, because (according to him) it was needed more for the protection of these than for that of anything else.

रक्षोहागमलघ्वसन्देहाः प्रयोजनम् । रक्षार्थं वेदानामध्येयं व्याकरणम् ।[12]
लोपागमवर्णविकारज्ञो हि सम्यग्वेदान्परिपालयिष्यति ॥.......
..............................प्रधानं च षडङ्गेषु व्याकरणम् ॥ etc.

It is not unreasonable to conjecture that the elevation o the Aṣṭādhyāyī to the Vedāṅga rank happened long after Pāṇini's time when it came to be studied more and more for purposes of preserving the Vedas. Unlike other Vedic auxiliaries, this was not[13] exclusively a Vedāṅga by intention, since it came from Pāṇini who wrote for both the languages. All the auxiliaries except the Aṣṭādhyāyī were connected solely with the Vedas in their beginning. Pāṇini concentrated more on the spoken language of his time. This explains why the account of the Vedic language given by him, inspite of his having hundreds of Sūtras dealing with them, "is[14] anything but comprehensive."

This conclusion receives further confirmation when we see that it was at a later period that the six different sciences were grouped together under the common designation 'Vedāṅgas'. The common term by which Manu refers to them in 3.184 is 'Pravacanas'. In the Chāndogya[15] Upaniṣad, there is given a list of the then subjects of study. Vyākaraṇa and Śikṣā also find a prominent place in it. But the Vedāṅgas are not mentioned as such. Even Pāṇini, while[16] accounting for words like Kramaka, Śikṣaka, etc., does not hint at the existence of any such distinct group in his time.

---

12. P. 1.
13. "But as this (Pāṇini's) great work only treats of Vedic grammar exceptionally, this Vedāṅga (Vyākaraṇa) is more properly identified with the lost grammatical Sūtras which preceded Pāṇini," says Monier William in his Dictionary, p. 964 (Veda) Col. 3.
14. Macdonell, Vedic Grammar, p. 1.
15. 7.1.
16. क्रमादिभ्यो वुन् 4.2.61

It is interesting to note that Vyākaraṇa is treated in various ways by various authors. Kātyāyana (as we have seen above) regards it as a Dharma Śāstra. To him the pronunciation of Śabdas as taught by Vyākaraṇa is attended with religious felicity, like the performance of Vedic rituals. Many of his Vārtikas draw an analogy between Vyākaraṇa and Dharma Śāstra, not to speak of the introductory ones with which we have already dealt.

Cf. नाव्यपवृक्तस्यावयवे तद्विधिर्यथा द्रव्येषु ।

Patañjali तद्यथा द्रव्येषु 'सप्तदश सामिधेन्यो भवन्ति' इति न सप्तदशारत्नि-
मात्रं काष्ठमग्नावभ्याधीयते । A.S. 3-4 (v. 9)(p. 25)

अनुकरणं शिष्टाशिष्टप्रतिषिद्धेषु यथा लौकिकवैदिकेषु ।
A. S. 2.3. (V. 3)

धर्मशास्त्रं च तथा etc. (p. 1.2.64, V. 39)

The following one makes this attitude explicit.

सिद्धं तु धर्मोपदेशने ऽनवयवविज्ञानाद्यथा लौकिकवैदिकेषु ।
Patañjali: सिद्धमेतत् । कथम् ? धर्मोपदेशनमिदं शास्त्रम् । V..5., p. 6.1.84.

Patañjali regards it as the supreme Vedāṅga. To him the study of Vyākaraṇa, like that of the Vedas, is a religious duty—a Nityakarma whose object cannot be questioned.

ब्राह्मणेन निष्कारणो धर्मः षडङ्गो वेदोऽध्येयो ज्ञेय इति ।[17]
प्रधानं च षडङ्गेषु व्याकरणम् ।

All these objects of the Śabdānuśāsana enumerated by Patañjali resolve, in a searching analysis, to nothing more than the preservation of the Vedas whose study itself is a Nityakarma.

Bhartṛhari speaks of it both as an Āgama and a Vedāṅga.

---

17. Kumārila has pointed out that this is not a Vedic quotation. So, let it not be understood that the Vedāṅgas as such were known even in the Vedic age. Cf. Udyota, Vol. 1, p 22. तथा च सन्ध्योपासनादिवत्साङ्गवेदाध्ययनतदर्थज्ञानरूपोऽयं धर्मो नित्य इति फलितम् । यथा नित्यस्याकरणे प्रत्यवायस्तत्करणे च तदभावः, तथा व्याकरणाध्ययनस्याननुष्ठाने च बोध्यम् ॥

य: पतञ्जलिशिष्येभ्यो भ्रष्टो व्याकरणागम: ।[18]

Also प्रथमं छन्दसामङ्गं प्राहुर्व्याकरणं बुधा: ॥[19]

Kumārila[20] in his criticism of Patañjali makes it clear that he is against its being called the supreme Vedāṅga and treats it as a Smṛti.

It may be also pointed out that Nāgeśa[21] hails the Akṣara-Samāmnāya as a revelation. Of all these, only Patañjali's view has gained wide currency.

Patañjali gives another set of examples (i.e., objects) which are perhaps stock ones culled from earlier works. This is suggested by his reference to them as इमानि च भूय:[22] (these are again) and also by his saying [23]तेभ्य एवं विप्रतिपन्नबुद्धिभ्योऽध्येतृभ्य आचार्य इदं शास्त्रमन्वाचष्टे—इमानि प्रयोजनान्यध्येयं व्याकरणमिति ॥

Kaiyaṭa and Nāgeśa[24] read in this term Ācārya, with great difficulty, a supposed reference to Patañjali. In fact, all these which are covered by the five given by Patañjali can be only a Prapañca (a further explanation) of the former ones. The two commentators[25] also make among these the distinction as important ones and unimportant ones.

It[26] might have been customary with grammatical teachers who preceded Patañjali to detail these instances with these interpretations, some of which give "a spiritualistic[27] colour to the speculations of grammar", and Patañjali might have only followed suit. Hence the charge of incorrect interpretation brought against Patañjali by Kumārila in the Vyākarṇādhikaraṇa of his Tantravārtika is not well justified.

18. See Vākyapadīya, 2.488.
19. Ibid, 1.11.
20. Vide Vyākarṇādhikarṇa in Tantra Vārtika, Jaimini 1.6.3.18–27 pp. 190–140, Ben. ed.
21. See the Laghuśabdenduśekhara, part I, p. 6 sqq (K.S.S.).
22. P. 2.
23. P. 5.
24. See Pradīpa and Udyota, p. 25.
25. Vide pp. 25–26.
26. See Niurkta, Pariśıṭṣa, 13.1.6–7. See also Sāyaṇa on R. V. I. 164.45, 4.58-3 for various interpretations.
27. See Krishnamachariar, A HISTORY OF CLASSICAL SANSKRIT LITERATURE, Introduction, p. 34.

If Patañjali was the first grammarian to give "a spiritualistic colour to the speculations of grammar", Kātyāyana was the first to give them a ritualistic one. Many of these verses quoted by Patañjali expound rather a ritualistic view and the interpretation of these given in the Mahābhāṣya is in all probability pre-Patañjalian.

Cf. दुष्टः शब्दः स्वरतो वर्णतो वा मिथ्याप्रयुक्तो न तमर्थमाह ।[28]
स वाग्वज्रो यजमानं हिनस्ति यथेन्द्रशत्रुः स्वरतोऽपराधात् ॥ etc.

Some are introduced by Patañjali with the words: याज्ञिकाः पठन्ति

The four-fold division of the words given in the interpretations of the Ṛks-चत्वारि शृङ्गाः and चत्वारि वाक्परिमिता is undoubtedly both pre-Pāṇinian and non-Pāṇinian.[29]

We have thus seen that Kātyāyana's approach to Vyākaraṇa is ritualistic. Let us now examine to what other influence or influences Kātyāyana or, for the matter of that, any other post-Pāṇinian commentator, was subject.

---

28. See pp. 2–4.
29. Pāṇini adopts a morphological division.
Cf. सुप्तिङन्तं पदम् (1.4.14)

CHAPTER II

The Pāṇinian School and the Prātiśākhyas : Post–Pāṇinian reciprocity of influence

A dispassionate study of the Kātyāyana Vārtikas reveals the fact that he is influenced to a great extent by what I would like to call 'Prātiśākhyaisms'. Towards the end of this chapter it will be shown that his authorship of the Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya cannot be accepted. Nevertheless, the more I study his Vārtikas in comparison with the Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya, the stronger grows my conviction that he had some connection with the latter. He probably belonged to that Śākhā. A similar conclusion which the repeated study of the Mahābhāṣya has made irresistable for me is that Patañjali has some predilection for the Atharva Veda and its Prātiśākhya.

Whatever might have been the nature of the relationship which the Prātiśākhyaisms had with the Pāṇinian grammar in their inception and the amount of sanction they received from it, there was certainly a policy of give and take followed between the Prātiśākhyas and the Pāṇinian commentators.

The following Sūtras among many others are seen in the Prātiśākhyas taken from Pāṇini either bodily or with slight modifications. In some an attempt to improve upon the latter is also clear.

Vāj. Pr. 1. 141	वर्णस्यादर्शनं लोपः	Cf.	P. 1. 1. 60
,, 1. 134	तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य	,,	P. 1. 1. 66
,, 1. 136	तस्मादित्युत्तरस्यादेः	,,	P. 1. 1. 67
,, 1. 143	संख्यातानामनुदेशो यथासंख्यम्	,,	P. 1. 3. 10
,, 1. 146	द्विरुक्तमाम्रेडितं पदम्	,,	P. 8. 1. 2
,, 1. 151	एकवर्णः पदमपृक्तम्	,,	P. 1. 2. 41
,, 1. 152	स एवादिरन्तश्च	,,	P. 6. 1. 85
,, 1. 126	तस्यादित उदात्तं स्वरार्धमात्रम्	,,	P. 1. 2. 32
,,	विप्रतिषेधे उत्तरं बलवदलोपे	,,	P. 1. 4. 2
,, 1. 48	अनन्तरं संयोगः	,,	P. 1. 1. 7

Vāj. Pr. 1. 75	मुखनासिकाकरणोऽनुनासिकः	,,	P. 1. 1. 8
,, 4. 141	नोदात्त: स्वरितोदयम्	,,	P. 8. 4. 67

Besides this, this Prātiśākhya makes use of a large number of Pāṇinian terms.

Ath. Prat. 1. 74	ईकारौकारौ च सप्तम्यर्थे	Cf.	P. 1. 1. 19
,, 1. 92	वर्णादन्त्यात्पूर्व उपधा	,,	P. 1. 1. 65
,, 2. 18	लोप उदस्थास्तम्भो: सकारस्य	,,	P. 8. 4. 61
,, 2. 96	अग्ने: स्तोमसोमयो:	,,	P. 8. 3. 82

Influence of the Prātiśākhyas on the post-Pāṇinian Commentators

The following exemplifies the influence of the Prātiśākhyas on Kātyāyana.

र and ल

We learn from the Pāṇinīyaśikṣā that according to Pāṇini, 'r'[30] is Mūrdhanya (cerebral) and 'l' dental. This is the only extant work of its kind which has kept the Pāṇinian pronunciation intact. But the Prātiśākhyas mostly class 'r' among dentals or those produced at the root of the teeth.

रो दन्तमूले	V. P. 1. 68
रेफस्य दन्तमूलानि	A. P. 1. 28
रेफो जिह्वाग्रमध्येन प्रत्यग्दन्तमूलेभ्य:	T. P. 1. 41
दन्तमूलीयस्तु तकारवर्गः सकार रेफलकाराश्च रेफं वर्त्स्यमेके	R. P. (pp. 36-37)

But so far as 'l' is concerned, all the Prātiśākyas agree with Pāṇini in including it among dentals.

लृलसिता दन्ते ।	V. P. 1. 69
दन्तमूलेषु च लकारे ।	T. P. 1. 42
सकाररेफलकाराश्च	R. V. (pp. 36-37)

How did 'r' which was cerebral according to Pāṇini came to be dentalised ?

30. Vide also the Laghuśabdenduśekhara, p. 47, K. S. S. Ed. and Macdonell, Vedic Grammar, p. 17.

The change of both[31] 'r' and 'ḍ'[32] to 'l' is observable even in the later vedic literature, especially in the Brāhmaṇas.

Aśrīra : R. V. 6. 28. 6; Aślīla : A. V. 14. 1. 27.
Śukra : R. V. 1. 84. 4. Śukla Ait. Br : 1. 29.
Araṃkṛta : R. V. 2. 1. 7. Alaṅkāra Śat. Br. 13. 8. 4. 7.

Whether this change was due to the influence[33] of the Dravidian languages or to sectional idiosyncracies, cannot be exactly ascertained. It is true that 'r' is a dental in the Dravidian languages. But labdaicism is a common phenomenon in many other languages which could not have had any contact with any member of the Dravidian family ; and in Sanskrit also the change of 'r' to 'l' is probably not due to any external influence, but must have happened ab[34] intra. Macdonell in his Vedic Grammar rightly observes :

---

31. Vide Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, p. 19.
32. 'Ḍ'. which often changes to 'l' in certain Brāhmaṇas (Cf. पुरोलाश, इला. etc., occurring in the Kauś. Br. instead of पुरोडाश, इडा etc.; also Cf. R. P. 1. 10. 11) may also have a similar history. This may be noted :- Though the text of the Kauś. Br. published by Lindner (Jena, 1887) does not record this change, a very old Ms. of the Adayar Library (2 Volumes, 41. B. 72 and 41. C 5) older than most of those which Lindner used for his editio princips, has throughout ल instead of र and ड. Lindner has himself noted this in certain Mss. Vide his Preface.
33. Kittel, Gundert and Caldwell have drawn up a long list of Sanskrit words which they suppose to have been borrowed from the Dravidian languages. See Kittel's preface to his Kannada Dictionary, Caldwell's Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian languages, pp. 159-163 and 567-579, and Ramakrishnaih's Studies in Dravidian Philology, p. 13, University of Madras, 1935.

    But a majority of these words need re-examination and no prima facie case can legitimately be made for the supposed Dravidian influence. This subject which by itself is a vast one has to be reserved for a separate study as it is not proper to dilate upon it here, going beyond the limits of our main subject.
34. See Uhlenbeck, A Manual of Sanskrit Phonetics, p. 51 and Batakrishna Ghosh, Linguistic Introduction to Sanskrit, pp. 80-81.

"It seems likely that the recorded Vedic dialect was descended from an Indo-Iranian one in which Rhotacism had removed every 'l'; but that there must have been another Vedic dialect in which I. E. r and l were kept distinct, and a third in which I. E. r became l throughout; from the latter two l must have found its way into the literary language to an increasing extent.........."

Dravidian influence might have smoothened the way to a certain extent and might have been one of the secondary causes. As for the exact cause, the meagreness of the material available makes any conjecture at this stage hazardous and premature.

The change of 'r' to 'l' could not have been quite unknown to Pāṇini. In the following Sūtras he gives the forms containing 'l' besides those containing 'r'.

जॄस्तम्भुम्रुचुम्लुचुग्रुचुग्लुचुग्लुञ्चुश्विभ्यश्च (3.1.58)

वा भ्राशम्लाशभ्रमुक्रमुक्लमुत्रसित्रुटिलषः (3.1.70)

In some instances which contain a palatal (and especially in roots beginning with श्र for, e.g., श्रथ and श्लथ), this change may due to the economy of effort, because it is easier to pronounce 'l' by the side of 'ś' than to pronounce the Pāṇinian 'r' which is not as near to it in respect of Sthāna as the former (l).

Pāṇini's silence about this change of 'r' to 'l' may mean that they, except those which he has mentioned, where only local idiosyncracies and had not gained sufficiently extensive currency in his time to necessitate the formation of a general rule covering all such words. As regards that of 'ḍ' to 'l' it may be said that it is one among the many other Śākhaic peculiarities advocated by the various Prātiśākhyas. In this connection the following Sūtra of the V. P. and the commentator's statement thereon are worthy of note.

डढौ लळ्हावेकेषाम् (4.144)

ढकारष्टवर्गीयो डकारश्च तत्प्रकृती ळ्हळकारौ जिह्वामूलीय उपध्मानीयश्च नासिक्यश्च न सन्ति माध्यन्दिनानाम् ॥

(Uvvaṭa on V. P. 8.29)

The only exit out of this maze lies in a knowledge of the true history of the various Vedic recensions and in a clarification of the

chronological relations of the Prātiśākhyas to Pāṇini. Unfortunately both these are still uncertain.

It is plain from the foregoing that the Indo-Germanic cerebral 'r' taught correctly by Pāṇini, was dentalised by the Prātiśākhyas and that this change was mainly due to the increasing interchangeability of the two sounds.

How did this interchangeability influence the vowels 'ṛ' and 'ḷ'?

ऋ and ऌ

ऋ and ऌ are two vowels peculiar to the Sanskrit language. Their inclusion in the alphabets of the Dravidian languages is due to the influence of the large number of words which they have borrowed from Sanskrit. No genuine Dravidian word contains them. Whitney[35] in an interesting note says that they occur in the Slavonic languages too. Even in Sanskrit the use of ऌ is limited[36] to a few derivatives of the root 'kḷp'. It never occurs in a word as final.[37] The inclusion of the long ॡ in the alphabet is only for the sake of an artifical symmetry. Kātyāyana, therefore, when instancing ऌ under the Sūtra ऋऌक्, is put to the necessity of roping[38] in onomatopoetic and other similar words.

ऌकारोपदेशो यदृच्छाशक्तिजानुकरणप्लुत्याद्यर्थः ॥

In instancing the Savarṇadīrgha, Patañjali ropes in the word ऌकार itself.

होतॄकारः *hotṝkāraḥ*

Pāṇini's silence about this (Savarṇadīrgha) will be presently explained.

'Ṛ' and 'ḷ' contain elements of, and in articulation resemble, their respective consonants 'r' and 'l'. The Prātiśākhyas analyse them

35. Sanskrit Grammar, p. 11.
36. See Ulhenbeck, A Manual of Sans. Phon. pp. 11 and 41; also Patañjali's introduction to ऋऌक्
37. See the Laghuśabdenduśekhara with Bhairavī, pp 56 and 57, K.S.S.
(न पदान्ताः परेऽणः सन्ति············)
38. See Patañjali on 1.1.9 (V. ऋकारऌकारयोः सवर्णविधिः); the Śabdakaustubha, pp. 19 and 53.

and find to be composed of a medial consonantal element (r or l, respectively) flanked on both sides by the vocalic elements.

ऋलृवर्णे रेफलकारौ संश्लिष्टावश्रुतिधरावेकवर्णौ (V. P. 4.146)

संस्पृष्टरेफमृवर्णम् (A. P. 1.37)

In regard to their Sthānas there is a conflict of views. The pronunciation of these sounds must have been undoubtedly vocalic in the Saṃhitās. The Ṛk Prātiśākhya classed them, rather mysteriously, among the Jihvāmūlīyas.

ऋकारल्कारावथ षष्ठ ऊष्मा जिव्हामूलीयाः प्रथमश्च वर्गः । (1–8)

Perhaps it is attempting to record the old pronunciation handed down to it by tradition, though there is no evidence to make us believe that vocalic pronunciation was still in vogue in its days. On the other hand, this Prātiśākhya[39] recognises the medial consonantal elements in these sounds; it[40] also says that 'ḷ' is not taken as a vowel when it stands in the beginning or end of a word; and these facts indicate that the consonantalisation of 'ṛ' and 'ḷ' had already begun and that their original nature was fast disappearing. It may also be gleaned from this[41] that the consonantalisation of 'ḷ' took place earlier than that of 'ṛ'. The term रेफ used instead of र and रकार in the Prātiśākhyas is a further proof of the increasing consonantal nature of the vowel ऋ in post-Vedic days. It seems probable that र came to be called रेफ and रिफित instead of रकार in order to be kept distinct from ऋकार which had a like pronunciation. The Vājasaneyi—Prātiśākhya agrees with the Ṛk–Prātiśākhya in classing 'ṛ' among Jihvāmūliyas, but disagrees when it classes 'ḷ' among dentals. The consonantal element in the latter sound seems to have become more defined in its time.

लृलसिता दन्ते (V. P. 1.69)

ऋऽकौ जिव्हामूले (Ibid. 1.65)

The T. P. says that 'Barsva' is the Sthāna of both.

उपसंहृततरे च जिव्हाग्रमृकारर्कारल्कारेषु बर्स्वेषूपसंहरति (T.P. 2-18)

39. See 13.34.
40. पदाद्यन्तयोर्न लृकारः स्वरेषु ………… .. ….(p. 13)
41. From the fact that 'ḷ' was not regarded as a vowel when it stood in these positions. Cf. V. P. स्वराश्च लृकारवर्जम् (1-87)

The Vaidikābharaṇa explains Barsva as follows :

> बर्स्वा नाम रेफटवर्गस्थानयोर्मध्यप्रदेशाः । ऋकारादिषु त्रिषूच्चार्येषु हन्वोः परस्परोपश्लेषः । जिव्हाग्रस्य बर्स्वेषूपसंहारश्च कार्यः । एतेषां बर्स्वाः स्थानम् ॥[42]

This represents an intermediate stage at which, though 'ṛ' and 'ḷ' had lost their original positions, they had not yet become dentals.

We are here apparently faced with a difficulty. It is generally agreed that the V. P. is much later than the T. P.; but we see that the former classes 'ṛ' among Jihvāmūliyas and thus contains a more primitive idea. This may be explained in two ways ; either that consonantalisation of 'ṛ' was slow in its Saṃhitā or that it has simply followed the R. P. in this matter. The indebtedness of the later Prātiśākhyas to the earlier ones is indeed great. There is also a third possibility that it wants to lay more emphasis on the consonantal nature of 'ḷ' by ascribing to it a Sthāna different from that of 'ṛ'. Above all, it may be pointed out, as has been done by[43] Whitney, that it is not very much clear what these Prātiśākhyas exactly mean by saying that 'ṛ' is a Jihvāmūlīya. This does not in any way resist our conclusion since we know that these sounds acquired consonantal properties as early as in the days of Pāṇini and long before the codification of the V. P.

According to the Pāṇinīyaśikṣā, 'ṛ' is a cerebral and 'ḷ' a dental.

Cf. स्युर्मूर्धन्या ऋटुरषा दन्त्या लृतुलसाः स्मृताः ।[44]

The Śikṣā rightly represents the view of Pāṇini who intends to cover the cerebralisation of 'n' preceded by 'ṛ' by his Sūtra रषाभ्यां नो णः समानपदे (8. 4. 1.) All the commentators are also agreed on this.

Here it may be noticed en passant that the pronunciation of 'ḷ' as lṛ current now in several parts of India can by no means go

42. Mysore G.O.L. Series, p. 75.
43. Trans. of the A.P., Journal of American Oriental Society, Vol. 7, pp. 358–359.
44. Verse 17.

back to Pāṇinian or Prātiśākhyaic antiquity. It was not current even in Patañjali's days. It seems to owe its origin to a confusion which often resulted in the pronunciation of this sound from the homogeneity which was recognised between this and 'ṛ' in later days. It is also possible that the way in which the letter is written in Devanāgarī (ऌ) is responsible for this.

Why Pāṇini does not analyse these sounds?

Pāṇini says उरण्रपरः (1. 1. 51) and he too knows that there is a consonantal element in both of them; but he does not care to analyse them. His reasons for this are obvious. He is a practical grammarian. He never splits hairs. His concept of these as well as other vowels is unitary. His unit of measurement of the time taken by a vowel is one Mātrā. The Prātiśākhyas[45] split the Mātrā into 'Aṇu' and 'Ardha-aṇu. According to Pāṇini, half a mora is the irreducible minimum, since that exactly is the time taken up in transition from one sound in a Saṃhiā to another.

This brief survey of the history of the consonantal pronunciation of the vowels 'ṛ' and 'ḷ' would be imperfect if we do not notice here what result it (this pronunciation) had in later days. In the following Vārtika Kātyāyana introduces the peculiar ऋ॒ॠ and ल्ॡ which contain two consonantal and two vocalic elements each and which are in all probability the result of the above process.

सवर्णदीर्घत्व ऋति ऋ॒ॠ वा वचनम् । ऌति ॡ वा वचनम् ।
(P. 6. 1. 101, V. 1-2)

होतृ + ऋकारः=*Hotṝkāraḥ* or होतृ ऋकारः[46]
होतृ + ऌकारः=*Hotḹkāraḥ* or होतृ ऌकारः ।

They are pronounced as conjunct consonants as it were.

---

45. See V. P. 1.60-61.
46. It is the predominance of the consonantal part that occasions these respective alternative forms and does not make us feel the Hiatus.

Patañjali flatly denies their vocalic nature : न च ऋ ऋकारो ल्लृकारो वाजस्ति ।।[47]

The commentator Kaiyaṭa attributes īṣatpṛṣṭaprayatna to these, the same which produces the Antasthas. He also points out that according to some, the quantity of each of these is also more than that of an ordinary Dīrgha. It is two and a half Mātrās.[48] Kaiyaṭa and Nāgeśa place this thing also beyond doubt that each of these contains a double element of its respective consonant.

How did these double consonantal elements develop in these sounds

The answer to this question which I propose to give is that since there was no long 'ḷ' in cases of Savarṇa-Sandhi of 'ḷ', this 'ḷ' containing two consonantal elements was substituted in place of the two ordinary 'ḷs. The same fate was often [49] dealt out to 'ṛ' which had become its Savarṇa.

To sum up : The pronunciation of 'ṛ' and 'ḷ' which was purely vocalic in the Saṃhitās became more and more consonantal in the post-Vedic language; and the Prātiśākhyas or those whose traditions they represent, by their attitude[50] imparted a fillip to this change.

How, in which respect and to what extent was Kātyāyana influenced by the Prātiśākhyas ?

When the cerebral 'r' was brought down to the level of the dental 'l' by the Prātiśākhyas, 'ṛ' which was intimately connected with 'ḷ' was also dealt out the same fate. This identity in Sthāna leads Kātyāyana to enjoin homogeneity between these vowels in the following Vārtika:–

ऋकारलृकारयोः सवर्णविधिः ।
होतृ लृकारः । *Hotṝkāraḥ* (P. 1. 14.4-V.5.)

47. Vide Patañjali and Kaiyaṭa on P, 1.1.9., pp. 224, N.S. Ed.
48. See ibid, p. 225 ('रेफद्वययुक्त' and 'लकारद्वययुक्त')
49. The susbstitution of ऋ is optional.
50. Which they indicate by the analysis of these sounds and by other facts.

We have thus seen that the indentity in Sthāna of 'r' and 'l' affected the relation between the corresponding vowels. It has now to be examined what results the similarity in pronunciation between 'r' and 'ṛ' had.

र् substituted by ऋ

When the pronunciation of 'ṛ' became more and more consonantal (among some sections at least), it sometimes displaced 'r'. This happened as early as in the Brāhmaṇa period. We can thus understand the word[51] तृच् (त्रि+ऋच्) which occurs frequently in some Brāhmaṇas and to which Kātyāyana introduces us in his Vārtika ऋचि त्रेरुत्तरपदादिलोपश्छन्दसि.........।[52] (P. 6. 1. 37, V. 5)

By छन्दसि Kātyāyana means the Brāhmaṇas and not the Saṃhitās.

It has been and will be repeatedly emphasized that Kātyāyana hunts up all the Śākhaic peculiarities in pronunciation while Pāṇini follows a different track. Hence the latter's silence over this.

In other instances the position is reversed, i. e., 'r' is sometimes employed to perform a vocalic office. This tendency is seen in the classical language. Instances are furnished by verses which use 'r' as a short 'ṛ' as it were. Though, as a rule, when a vowel is followed by a conjunct consonant, it becomes a 'Guru', it fails to do so in the following cases, because the consonantal combination following it has 'r' for its second member.

प्रह्वेति पुनः पिङ्गलमुनेर्विकल्पविधायकं सूत्रम् ।[53]
ततश्च कुमारे—
सा मङ्गलस्नानविशुद्धगात्री गृहीतप्रत्युद्गमनीयवस्त्रा ।
निर्वृत्तपर्जन्यजलाभिषेका प्रफुल्लकाशा वसुधेव रेजे ॥ (7-11)[54]

---

51. We are reminded of the elision of one र् before another, taught by Pāṇini 8. 3. 14.
52. See also R. P. 15. 23.
53. Chandomañjarī with Jivananda Vidyasagara's commentary, p. 43, Calcutta, 1887.

अत्र प्रशब्दे परे गुरोर्लघुत्वम् ।

प्राप्य नाभिह्रदमज्जनमाशु प्रस्थितं निवसनग्रहणाय ।[55]
औपनीविकमरुन्ध किल स्त्री वल्लभस्य करमात्मकराभ्याम् ॥

इति माघे ।

अत्र ह्रशब्दे परे गुरोर्लघुत्वम् । तीव्रप्रयत्नोच्चारणेनात्र लघुत्वमिति कण्ठाभरणः ॥

नाहं बालः सुबाहुर्नखरत्रिशिरसौ दूषणस्ताडकाहम् ।

Varāhamihira, too, has the following in his Bṛhajjātaka:

शुक्रज्ञौ सुहृदौ समः सुरगुरू सौरस्य चान्येऽरयो[56]
ये प्रोक्ताः स्वत्रिकोणभादिषु पुनस्तेऽमी मया कीर्तिताः ॥
स्वोच्चसुहृत्स्वत्रिकोणनवांशैः स्थानबलं स्वगृहोपगतैश्च ।[57]

This is the reading which Bhaṭṭotpala, the greatest and the oldest known commentator on Varāhamihira, had before him. He comments : स्वत्रिकोणे आत्मीये मूलत्रिकोणे ।[58]

The change of the reading त्रिकोण into दृगाण in the latter examples for which some modern editors are responsible, is unwarranted. त्रिकोण is more in keeping with the context. Such a convenient change is impossible in the former example, because meaning prohibits it. There is also another instance pointed out by Wackernagel[59] where 'ṛ' is interchangeable with 're', Dṛgāṇa for Drekkāṇa. क्रिमि a latter variant of कृमि also has a similar history. We now sum up our conclusions :-

(1) The interchangeability of 'r' and 'l' tended to dentalise 'r' in the Prātiśākhyas.

(2) This had its consequence on 'ṛ' and 'ḷ' the mutual homogeneity of which is admitted by Kātyāyana.

---

54. This is the reading given by the author of this work. Mallinātha reads पत्युद्गमनीय instead. The Adyar Library Ms. 30 l. 35 has : गृहीतवत्युद्गमनीयवस्त्रा ।
55. 10. 60.
56. 2. 17.
57. 2. 19.
58. pp. 30 and 31, Venkateswara Press Ed.
59. See Die Vokale ṛ, ṝ, ḷ, p. 31, Altindische Grammatik.

(3) The consonantal pronunciation of 'ṛ' was responsible for the substitution of 'r' by 'ṛ in certain cases and

(4) that of 'ṛ' by 'r' in others.

Other instances of Prātiśākhyaic influence on Kātyāyana

The place of the Ayogavāhas

The three voiceless[60] spirants Visarjanīya, Jihvāmūlīya and Upadhmānīya, together with Anusvāra, Anunāsika and Yama are called Ayogavāhas.[61] Pāṇini does not read them in his Aksarasamāmnāya. He is a more practical grammarian than his successors and is probably justified in his omission. The Ayogavāhas as sounds, do not stand on their own feet; as Whitney[62] says, their utterance lays on the mouth-organs no compulsion of a definite shaping action; they depend for their existence on a contiguous sound. Pāṇini, in preparing a homogeneous alphabet of concrete independant sounds, perhaps thinks that the unity of his Akṣarasamāmnāya would be disturbed if the Ayogavāhas are brought in.[63] As regards the Jihvāmūlīya and the Upadhmāniya it may be noted that in 8.3.37 (कुप्वोः ≍क≍पौ च) Pāṇini departing from his usual practice, represents these sounds phonetically (in conjunction with the respective contiguous sounds) without naming them. He seems to have understood them as qualities rather than as sounds proper in flesh and blood.

Kātyāyana with whom the Prātiśākhya bias prevails, desires them to be read both among 'Aṇs' and 'Śars', for some purposes pointed out by him.

अयोगवाहानामट्सु णत्वम् ।

शर्षु जश्भावषत्वे ।

---

60. See Macdonell, Vedic Gr. p. 13, and Whitney Sans Gr. p. 23.
61. For the etymology of this word, see Patañjali and Kaiyaṭa on हयवरट् । एवं चाक्षरसमाम्नायेऽनुक्ताः सन्तो वहन्ति प्रयोगं निर्वाहयन्तीत्ययोगवाहपदव्युत्पत्तिर्दर्शिता । (p. 114, Vol. I)
62. Sans. Gr., p. 23.
63. Whitney thinks that "many of them are comparatively recent members of the Alphabetic system." Ibid. p. 23.

अविशेषेण संयोगोपधासंज्ञालोऽन्त्यद्विर्वचनस्थानिवद्भावप्रतिषेधाः ।[64]

(A. S. 5, V. 5–7)

Patañjali[65] questions the necessity of Kātyāyana's effort and characterizes most of his purposes as securable otherwise than through the reading of the Ayogavāhas in these places.

We are here reminded of the various Prātiśākhyas[66] which read the Ayogavāhas by the side of the latter, i. e. शर् (श, ष and स)

That Pāṇini was not at all carried away by what I should choose to call Śākhaic peculiarities, is clear from his not mentioning 'Yama' anywhere in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. The introduction of this into the Pāṇinian grammar serves no purpose whatsoever, unless to exhibit the Prātiśākhya mentality were a purpose. Though the value of the other Ayogavāhas is unquestionable in the Pāṇinian grammar, the real question is whether they are to be read in the Samāmnāya or not. It is but being just to Kātyāyana and others of his class to point out that they had their own reasons for being the debtors of the Prātiśākhyas to which we will return at the end of this chapter.

The doubling of the Upadhmānīya and the Jihvāmūlīya stated by Kātyāyana as one of the purposes for which they are read, has really no practical value in the scientific grammar of Pāṇini. The instances are उर ≍ ≍ कः and उर ≍ ≍ पः The Prātiśākhyas[67] deal with such things ad nauseam. It is this instinct that accounts for the doubling of the Jihvāmūlīya and the Upadhmānīya better than anything else. Elsewhere[68] Kātyāyana says that the 'Śars' are doubled when followed by 'Khays' or vice versa.

शरः खयः ।[69]

e. g. स्थ्याली, वत्स्सः, अप्स्सरा ॥

---

64. For a correct interpretation of the third Vārtika see **Udyota** and Chāyā, Vol. I, p. 116.
65. Vide Patañjali's comments on these; also Chāyā p. 117.
66. Cf. R.P., P. 25, T. P. 1.9 and V. P. 8.8. sqq.
67. See R. P. Paṭala 6, and V. P. Adhyāya 4, etc.
68. 8.4.47.
69. Cf. R. P. 6.6. The commentator Uvvaṭa actually quotes this Vārtika for comparison.

That the doubling of consonants in cases like this makes no significant difference in pronunciation, has been made plain by Patañjali who says

न व्यञ्जनपरस्यैकस्य वानेकस्य वा श्रवणं प्रति विशेषोऽस्ति ॥

Nāgeśa in whom Pāṇini and Patañjali find their ablest exponent observes ;

विसर्गजिव्हामूलीयादेरुच्चारणे विशेषस्याग्रहादुच्चारणस्य कर्त्तुमशक्यत्वाच्च शास्त्रप्राप्तिमात्रेणैतत्प्रयोजनकथनमिति संतोष्टव्यम् ॥

Commenting upon Bhoja's Sarasvatī-Kaṇṭhābharaṇa[70] Nārāyaṇadaṇḍanātha also says :

विसर्जनीयजिव्हामूलीयोपध्मानीयनासिक्यानुस्वारयमास्तु पृथगुपदेशप्रयोजनाभावान्नोपदिश्यन्ते ।

It is noteworthy here that the Jihvāmūlīya, the Upadhmānīya and the Ānunāsikya are not current among the Mādhyandinas.[71]

Kātyāyana sometimes splits vowels into their component parts which have no practical value in Pāṇini's grammar. The genesis of this tendency to split hairs lies in his Prātiśākhya training. It has already been pointed out that while Pāṇini adopts Mātrā as the unit in measuring the quantity of vowels, the Prātiśākhyas climb down to Ardhamātrā, Aṇu, etc. The Bhāṣyakāra[72] makes Pāṇini's position quite clear when he says:

इह व्याकरणे यः सर्वाल्पीयान्स्वरव्यवहारः स मात्रया भवति ।
नार्धमात्रया व्यवहारोऽस्ति ।

Similarly, Pāṇini has no vowel measuring beyond 3 moras. But Patañjali and other later commentators on whom the influence of

---

70. See Trivandrum Sans. Series No. CXVII, p. 5.
71. See V. P. 8.29.
72. See Patañjali on 8.1.9.
Cf. Sāṅkhāyanaśrauta sūtra 1.2 3; Āśv. Śr. Sūtra 1.2.10 and 14, with Nārāyaṇa's commentary (चतुर्मात्रा याज्ञिकी प्लुतिः). The Śābdika-Cintāmaṇi also says :
न च चतुर्मात्रः प्लुतोऽप्रसिद्ध इति वाच्यम् । छान्दोग्ये तत्प्रसिद्धेः ।
p. 129, Vol. I Adyar Library Ms. It has to be said to the credit of the Vārtikakāra that he mentions it only as something to be avoided. See V. 5. Ās. 3-4 and V. 2. P. 8.2.106

the ritualistic science seems to have prevailed, accept Pluta measuring 4 Mātrās. On P. 8.2.106 Patañjali says :

इष्यत एव चतुर्मात्रः प्लुतः ।

Pāṇini[73] deals with a sound in its integral entirety; in treating a sound he works within the framework of what its form was during his time; historical bias does not lead him into splitting it unnecessarily into parts. In the following Vārtika Kātyāyana speaks of such vowels which are parts and do not exist independently of the whole formed by them.

वर्णैकदेशा वर्णग्रहणेन चेत्सन्ध्यक्षरे समानाक्षरविधिप्रतिषेधः ।[74]

Patañjali's introduction to this is इह हि समुदाया अप्युपदिश्यन्ते अवयवा अपि । अभ्यन्तरश्च समुदायेऽवयवः । तद्यथा वृक्षः प्रचलन्सहावयवैः प्रचलति ।

Kaiyaṭa's[75] explanation : इहि हि समुदाया अपीति । ऋ ऌ ए ओ ऐ औ इति । अवयवा अपीति । अ इ उ ए् रट् लणिति ॥[75]

The question whether the parts dependent on the whole (component vowels) can also be treated apart from the whole, which the Vārtikakāra asks, is opposed to the spirit of Pāṇini.

The Ardha--Ekāra and Ardha-Okāra referred to by Kātyāyana, are rejected by Patañjali saying that they are used only by the Sātyamugrirāṇāyanīyas.

Kātyāyana : अतपर एच इग्घ्रस्वादेशे ।[76]

Patañjali :

न तौ स्तः । यदि हि तौ स्यातां तावेवायमुपदिशेत् । ननु च भोश्छन्दोगानां सात्यमुग्रिराणायनीया अर्धमेकारमर्धमोकारं चाधीयते । सुजाते ए अश्वसूनृते । अध्वर्यो

73. Macdonell in his Vedic Grammar says that e and o are really simple long vowels, being dipthongs only in origin. See p. 5, footnote.
74. AS. 3-4, V. 6.
75. See also the following Vārtikas and the Mahābhāṣya on them. Vol. 1, p. 102. Vide Śābdika-Cintāmaṇi, Vol. I, p. 145, Adyar Library, MS. 8. K.3. Kātyāyana's attitude is made very clear by the latter.
76. A.S. 3-4, V. 4.

ओ अद्रिभिः सुतम् । शुक्रं ते ए अन्यद्यजतं ते ए अन्यदिति। पार्षदकृतिरेषा तत्र भवताम्। नैव हि लोके नान्यस्मिन्वेदेऽर्ध एकारोऽर्ध ओकारो वास्ति ॥

In discarding the Sūtra एच इग्घ्रस्वादेशे[77] Kātyāyana says : सिद्धमेङः[78] सस्थानत्वात्, ऐचोश्चोत्तरभूयस्त्वात् । In the first Vārtika he points out the indentity in the respective Sthānas of 'i' and 'e' and 'u' and 'o'. From the Pāṇinīyaśikṣā, the Siddhāntakaumudī and other similar works we know that according to Pāṇini, 'e' is both palatal and guttural and 'o' both dental and labial. From where does Kātyāyana get the idea that 'e' is purely palatal and 'o' labial ? The Śābdikacintāmaṇi contains the following answer.

अथवा एकारः शुद्धतालव्यः, ओकारस्तु शुद्धौष्ठ्यः इति मतमादाय तयोः स्थाने इवर्णोवर्णह्रस्वावेव भविष्यत इति सिद्धमित्यर्थः । तथा च बह्वृच-प्रातिशाख्यम्—[79] तालव्यावेकार ....।

Criticising P. 1.1.70. Kātyāyana refers[80] to the three Vṛttis (Druta, Madhyama and Vilambita) and says that if the vowel to which 'त्' is attached is pronounced in the Drutavṛtti, it cannot indicate those pronounced in the other two and that the Sūtra under discussion would in that case fall in need of a supplement.

द्रुतायां तपरकरणे मध्यमविलम्बितयोरुपसंख्यानं कालभेदात् ॥

It is in the Prātiśākhyas[81] and the Śikṣās that we come across these vṛttis. Pāṇini had no necessity to deal with them.

The Prātiśākhyas[82] name the different sounds or their symbols by adding 'Kāra' to the sound of the letter if a vowel or to the letter followed by 'a' if a consonant, e. g., Akāra, Kakāra etc.,

The sole exception is 'r' which is called only 'ra' or 'repha' (र + इफ)

77. P. 1.1.48.
78. P. 1.1.4, V. 3 and 4.
79. Adyar Library Ms. 8 K.3. Vol. I, p. 124.
80. V. 4; See also P. 1.1.69, V. 11,
81. See R.P. 13-19, Ṛktantra 2.4, Nāradaśikṣā 6.22; Yājñavalkyaśikṣā 54, etc.
82. V.P. 1.37-39 and R. P. p. 47.

These suffixes are frequently used in the post-Pāṇinian grammatical literature. Kātyāyana introduces them in his Vārtikas[83] वर्णात्कारः and रादिफः. Goldstucker[84] thinks that Pāṇini never uses 'Kāra' because "his terms are such as apply to a written book". I, on the other hand, am inclined to believe that originally it was added only to such onomatopoetic and exclamatory sounds as हिकार (हिंकरोति) वषट्कार, etc. which occur frequently in the Brāhmaṇa[85] literature. An instance is provided by P. 1.2.35. (उच्चैस्तरां वा वषट्कारः) itself. Pāṇini, with his neverfailing eye on the scientific nature of his terminology, does not make any indiscriminate use of this suffix.

Kātyāyana seems also to be indebted to the Ṛktantra. Dr. Suryakanta in his Introduction[86] to this work notices similarity between certain Sūtras of this Prātiśākhya and Kātyāyana Vārtikas. He points out also that in a few cases the latter makes some improvement upon the former.

To add to all this, we have the evidence of the following Vārtikas in which this influence of the Prātiśākhyas is quite manifest.

उकारं दुद (दूडभः) नाशे च (दूणाशः) पुरो दाशे (पुरोडाशः) (V. P. 3.42-44) (See also R. P. 5.53)	Cf. Kātyāyana दुरो दाशनाशदभध्येषु । (P. 6.3.109, V.5)

With regard to 'दूणाश' Uvvaṭa says मृग्यमुदाहरणम् ।

षड्दशदन्तयोः सङ्ख्यावयोर्थ्ययोश्च (V. P. 3.47)

Uvvaṭa : न हि संहितायामुदाहरणमस्ति ।

Cf. Kātyāyana : षष उत्वं दतृदशसूत्तरपदादेः ष्टुत्वं च,

e. g., षोडन्, षोडश । (P. 6.3.109, V. 4)

83. P. 3.3.108, V. 3-4.
84. Pāṇini, p. 39.
85. See Kauś. Br. 3.5. etc.,
86. P. 41. It is generally contended that this work is a Prātiśākhya of the Sāma Veda.

ता आघादनाडम्वरात् e. g., दार्वाघाटः (V. P. 3.48)	Cf. Kātyāyana दारावाहनोऽणन्त्यस्य च टः संज्ञायाम् (P. 3.2.49, V.1)
तद्वृहतौ करपत्योस्तलोपश्च, e. g. तस्करः बृहस्पतिः (V. P. 3.52)	Cf. Kātyāyana तद्बृहतोः करपत्योश्चोरदेवतयोः सुट्तलोपश्च (P. 6.1.157, V. 1)[87]
अलोपो मांस्पचन्याः V. P. 4.41; See also R. P. 481	Cf. Kātyāyana पदादिषु मांस्पृस्नूनामुपसंख्यानम् (P. 6.1.63, V. 1)

Patañjali : पदादिषु मांस्पृस्नूनामुपसंख्यानम् । यन्नीक्षणं मांस्पचन्या ।

ख्यातेः खयौ कशौ गार्ग्यः सक्थ्यौक्थ्यमुक्थ्यवर्जम् V. P. 4.165, See also R. P. 7.55	Cf. Kātyāyana चक्षिङः क्शाञ्ख्याञौ (P. 2.4.54, V. 1)

"क्शापत्तिस्तु चरकाणां शाखिनां न तु माध्यन्दिनीयशाखिनां भवतीति दिक् ।"
(V. P., 306, foot-note, Benares Ed.)

Together with these instances, the numerous terms used by the Prātiśākhyas and introdueed by Kātyāyana into his Vārtıkas and also the great number of Vedic words which he accounts for, prove that he came to comment upon Pāṇini only after he had exhausted the whole of the Vedic literature accessible to him and had digested[88] all the Prātiśākhyas dealing with them. This cxtensive knowledge has left an indelible stamp on some of his Vārtikas. He flourished in the golden age of the Prātiśākhyas. The study of the Vedas and the Prātiśākhyas had gained so much popularity in his time that he is led to reject the following Sūtras as explaining terms too widely known to the contemporary world.

---

87. This is not a Gaṇa Sūtra but a Kātyāyana Vārtika.
88. In this connection it may be noted that one Vararuci is known as the commentator of the T. P.
Cf. व्याख्यानं प्रातिशाख्यस्य वीक्ष्य वाररुचादिकम् ।
Tribhāṣyaratna, p. 1. (Mys. O. S) But the evidence before us is not sufficient to identify him with the grammarian.

Pāṇini: परः सन्निकर्षः संहिता
विरामोऽवसानम् } 1.4.109 and 110

Kātyāyana :
संहितावसानयोर्लोकविदितत्वात्सिद्धम् । (V. 8, P. 1.4.110)

That he is occasionally swayed by the Prātiśākhyas and the sporadic Vedic words, is certainly not a weakness in him because behind all this submission to their influences there existed a genuine desire to impart the maximum amount of elasticity and comprehensiveness to the Aṣṭādhyāyī which was gaining greater and greater importance and had or was tending to become the perfect Vedāṅga. No Vedic word could therefore be left out of its purview. A small number of words accounted for by him are not to be found in the extant Vedic literature; but they might have existed in the various other recensions of the Vedas which have not come down to us. In the second part here we saw how a great number of words belonging to the pre-Pāṇinian Vedic literature are included by Kātyāyana. Why did Pāṇini leave them out ? We cannot easily impute oversight to him. His study of the world of linguisitic facts has been so thoroughly exhaustive and meticulously minute that no linguistic phenomenon worth notice could have escaped his eagle-eye. Not this way lies the explanation. In fact, it shall never be offered until and unless this thread of comparative research is caught up and developed further. No claims are here laid to anything like finality of view; the above discussion of the influence of the Prātiśākhyas on Kātyāyana is open to revision, should the parallelisms on which the discussion is based be explained more convincingly by other minds. The object, anyway, will have been attained if this line of research will lead us any the nearer to a completer understanding of the history of the many phonetic changes embodied in the various Vedic recensions as well as the dates of the Prātiśākhyas.

It is held by Goldstucker and others that Kātyāyana is also the author of the Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya. But a closer consideration of the facts as they stand might show that the identity of the Vārtika-kāra with the author of the Prātiśākhya is not probable. The author of the Vārtikas evinces more ingenuity and exhaustiveness than the

author of the Prātiśākhya. He shows not only that he is steeped in the Prātiśākhya lore but also that he has had a thorough training in the scientific methods which are of Pāṇini's making. The difference between the Vārtikas and the Prātiśākhyas is the difference between the latter and the Aṣṭādhyāyī Sūtras. A comparison of the few Prātiśākhya aphorisms quoted above with the corresponding Vārtikas will bear this out. In the first instance, the three Prātiśākhya Sūtras are summarised by Kātyāyana in one Vārtika in a scientific way; in the second he has substituted दन्त by दत् and has added in Pāṇinian terms उत्तरपदादे: ष्टुत्वं च; in the third, he replaces आवातात् by आहन: (the root-form) and adds also अन्त्यस्य च ट: संज्ञायाम्; in the fourth, there is चोरदेवतयो: सुट् more in the Vārtika than in the Prātiśākhya. In the fifth, the difference in ideology is remarkable. The Prātiśākhya thinks that मांस्पचन्या: is an instance of अ लोप, i. e., 'a' of मांस is elided when followed by पचन्या:. According to the Vārtikakāra मांस् is an independent word and is not a mutilated form of मांस; the whole word मांस् is the substitute of मांस. This position is made clear by him in the next Vārtika in which he says that नस is subtituted by नस् instead of saying that 'a' of the former is elided in certain cases,

नस्नासिकाया यत्तस्क्षुद्रेषु ।

In the last, the Vārtika gives the Pāṇinian root चक्षिङ् instead of ख्याति which is found in the Prātiśākhya.

Many more instances might be adduced; but these are sufficient for our purpose.

The Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya, on the other hand, does not record any improvement on Pāṇini in any respect. In fact it does not even hold a candle to Pāṇini. Though it is true that this Prātiśākhya has taken over some Sūtras bodily from Pāṇini, both its method and its material are reminiscential of the older Prātiśākhyas rather than of Pāṇini. A Vārtikakāra who knew his Pāṇini would have turned out a more scientific work than this. The occurrence of the above parallelisms in the Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya is no proof of Kātyāyana's authorship, since the occurrence far from being restricted to this, extends to other Prātiśākhyas also. It may be pointed out, above all that has been considered hitherto, that

there is an important difference in view between the Vārtikakāra and the author of the Prātiśākhya regarding the quantitites of the component vowels of ऐ and औ. According to the former, ऐ is $\frac{1}{2}$a + 1$\frac{1}{2}$ e and औ is $\frac{1}{2}$a + 1$\frac{1}{2}$ o. The following Vārtika says that whenever ऐ and औ are substituted by other sounds, they are substituted by vowels homogeneous to their respective second ingredients which form their major portions.

ऐचोश्चोत्तरभूयस्त्वात् ।[89] (P. 1. 1. 48, V. 4)

But the [90]Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya divides the quantity equally between the parts. After commenting upon V. P. 1. 73, Uvvaṭa draws attention to the view held by our grammarian (Vārtikakāra)

अत्र केचिदाहु :-अकारस्यार्धमात्रा एकारस्याध्यर्धा ऐकारे; अकारस्यार्धमात्रा ओकारस्याध्यर्धा औकारे इति । तथा चोक्तम्-अर्धमात्रा तु कण्ठ्यस्य ऐकारौकारयोर्भवेत् ॥

The conclusion therefore is that Kātyāyana was not the author but a close student and follower of the Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya.

Patañjali's position

Patañjali agrees with Kātyāyana in most of these cases because his object, too, was to enlarge the scope of the Aṣṭādhyāyī wherever necessary. It also deserves mention here that he shows some predilection for the Atharva Veda and its Prārtiśākhya.

Among the beginning of the four Vedas quoted by him at the outset of his work, that of the Atharvan, namely शं नो देवीरभिष्टय finds the first place. It is unreasonable to contend that this has been mentioned first on account of its beginning with the auspicious word शम् because his preference for the Atharvan is seen in the following instance also, in which he could have as well quoted the beginning of any one of the other three Vedas or at least that of the Ṛk which deservedly commands precedence in all matters.

---

89. Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri thinks that "the way in which Tamil 'ai' was and is pronounced may have influenced the pronunciation of Sanskrit 'ai' in the pre-Christian era." Journal of Oriental Research, Madras, Vol. V. b. 285 (1931)

90. See V. P. 1. 73.

ओमित्युक्त्वा वृत्तान्तराः शमित्येवमादीञ्शब्दान्पठन्ति ।[91]

In giving the Prayatnas of the various sounds under P. 1. 1. 10 Patañjali quotes the following from the Atharva Prātiśākhya :

स्पृष्टं करणं स्पर्शानाम् ।
ईषत्स्पृष्टमन्तस्थानाम् ।
विवृतमूष्मणां स्वराणां च ॥

The Kārikā

सदृशं त्रिषु लिङ्गेषु सर्वासु च विभक्तिषु ।
वचनेषु च सर्वेषु यन्न व्येति तदव्ययम् ॥

which he quotes on P. 1. 1. 38 to explain the term Avyaya, is taken by him from the Gopatha[92] Brāhmaṇa which belongs to this Veda. All this is not accidental in the work of a grammarian of Patañjali's calibre. It is therefore reasonable to assume that he had some connection with the Atharva Veda.

No doubt, most of the Prātiśākhyaisms introduced by Kātyāyana receive Patañjali's tacit approval and the latter thus in a way shares the Prātiśākhya influence with the former; yet it must be noted that he and the Vārtikakāra differ on more points than they agree. Even in the matter of their liability to be influenced by the Prātiśākhyas, Patañjali's liability is infinitesimal and deducible only from one or two quotations. While he was eager to admit all that had gained sufficiently extensive currency, he was equally eager to check further tendencies to the breach of grammatical rules. He repeatedly says that grammarians should not follow others who differ from them, but others should follow the grammarians in the use of correct words. He insists that Padakāras should follow grammarians and never vice versa.

यद्यमववग्रहः प्राप्नोति ।[93] न लक्षणेन पदकारा अनुवर्त्याः पदकारैर्नाम लक्षणमनुवर्त्यम् । यथालक्षणं पदं कर्तव्यम् ॥

---

91. See Paspaśā, Vol. I, p. 5.
92. 1. 26,
93. P. 3. 1. 109; see also 6. 1. 207 and 8-2-16; cf. also छन्दोवत्कवयः कुर्वन्ति । नह्यपेष्टिरस्ति (P. 1. 4. 3.)

Patañjali thus not only confers on the Pāṇinian grammar a fixity and an independence of its own, but gives it also the added importance of a Vedāṅga which should command obedience from the Padakāras and save the Padapāṭha from further textual vicissitudes.

Later Commentators

The Prātiśākhya influence did not exhaust itself with Kātyāyana. Even so late a commentator as Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita shows his leaning towards the Prātiśākhyas when he says :

अत्रन्त्रमिति ।[94] इह त्वविवक्षायां प्रमाणं किमिति चेल्लक्ष्यदर्शनं प्रातिशाख्यादिकं चेति ग्रहाण । तथाहि–येऽरा इत्यत्रैकारः 'तनूनपात्' 'शचीपतिम्' इत्यत्र पदपाठे ऊदोतौ चाद्योदात्तौ इति सकलबह्वृचप्रसिद्धम् । तनूनपाच्छचीपतिशब्दयोः "उभे वनस्पत्यादिषु युगपत्" इति पूर्वोत्तरपदयोराद्युदात्तत्वे कृते अनुदात्तं पदमेकवर्जम् (P. 6. 1. 1857) इति शेषनिघातः । पूर्वपदभूतयोस्तनूशचो एतयोरन्त्यस्यपाक्षिकं स्वरितत्वं प्रातिशाख्ये उक्तम् :–

जात्यवद्वा तथा वान्तौ तनूशचीति पूर्वयोः इति ।
तथा स्वरितार्धस्योदात्तत्वे प्रातिशाख्यमपि ।
एकाक्षरसमावेशे पूर्वयोः स्वरितः स्वरः ।
तस्योदात्ततरोदात्तादर्धमात्रार्धमेव वा ॥
अनुदात्तः परः शेषः स उदात्तश्रुतिर्न चेत् ।
उदात्तं वोच्यते किंचित् स्वरितं वाक्षरं परम् ।
इति ।
अनुस्वारोत्तमा अनुनासिकाः" (T, P. 2. 30)[95]
"यमानुस्वारनासिक्यानां नासिका अनुनासिकाश्चोत्तमाः" (V. P. 1. 74)

अत एव प्रातिशाख्येऽपि "आ त्वा रथम्" इति मन्त्रे तकारस्य द्वित्वविकल्प उदाहृतः ॥[96]

---

94. Prauḍhamanoramā on P. 1. 2. 32.
He follows the Ṛk Prātiśākhya in this instance.
It may be remembered that he is a Ṛgvedin.
95. Ibid, p. 35.
96. P. 75 (P. 8. 4. 47)

प्रातिशाख्यरीत्येत्यवेहि ।[97] तथा हि अनुस्वारो व्यञ्जनञ्चाक्षराङ्गमित्युक्त्वा स्वरान्तरे व्यञ्जनानुत्तरस्येति तत्र सूत्रितम् ....। न चैतावता क्वचिद्रूपेऽनिष्ट-मापद्यते येन प्रतिशाख्यपरिभाषामुपेक्ष्य नटभार्यावद्व्यञ्जनानीति (Cf. Patañjali on 6. 1. 2) चाश्रित्य दर जाग् इत्यादि द्विरूच्यते ॥

The commentator Haridīkṣita does not agree with his grandfather in the interpretation of तस्यादित उदात्तमर्धह्रस्वम् ।
(P. 1. 2. 32)

Says he :

अविवक्षितमित्यर्थं इति ।[98] इदं च वक्ष्यमाणं प्रातिशाख्यम्-यच्छाखास्थं तच्छाखास्थवैदिकोदाहरणविषयम् । तनूनबाच्छचीपतिशब्दयोरिति । अस्य यद्यपीत्यादिः । शेषनिघात इति । अस्य तथापीति शेषः ।

तदुक्तं भाष्ये—अर्धह्रस्वशब्दोऽर्धमात्रायां रूढ इति ।

हरिरप्याह—

प्रमाणमेव ह्रस्वादावनुपात्तं प्रतीयते । इति ।

अनुपात्तमपि अर्धमात्रारूपप्रमाणमेवोपलक्ष्यत इत्यर्थं तस्य हेलाराज आह-एवं च लोकेऽन्यशाखासु च दीर्घादिष्वपि अर्धमात्रैवोदात्तेति भावः ।

A tradition current among the Pandits has it that the Śabdaratna was written by Nāgeśa himself and presented to Haridīkṣita, his Guru, under whose name it has come down to us. This is confirmed by the striking similarity that exists between the thoughts embodied in this work and those in the Laghuśabdenduśekhara.

---

97. See the Śabdakaustubha on P. 1. 1. 59 (द्विर्वचनेऽचि), तस्यादित उदात्तमर्धह्रस्वम् Vol. I, p. 315. It is interesting to note that in this case he had even set aside Patañjali's maxim नटभार्यावद्व्यञ्जनानि भवन्ति— (See Patañjali on 6. 1.2)
98. Śabdaratna, Part I, pp. 31-34, Kāśī Sans. Series,

CHAPTER III

Patañjali a Lakṣyaika-cakṣus : His lofty realism

We have noted above that Pāṇini is a practical grammarian. Kāṭyāyana, though he generally[99] preserves the spirit of Pāṇini, sometimes misses it and on such occasions (as in the first instance given below), he is pulled up by Patañjali in whom Pāṇini finds the ablest champion of his lofty realism in grammar. Patañjali does not countenance unnecessary theorization. To him language and grammar are coterminous. He is a लक्ष्यैकचक्षुः, one who sees Lakṣaṇa through Lakṣya. The difference between Lakṣanaikacakṣuṣṭva and Lakṣyaikacakṣuṣṭva is the difference between Idealism and Realism or that between theory and practice. Any linguistic phenomenon which neither the Vedic nor the classical language embodied and was not supported by popular[100] usage is branded by him as unfit for grammatical treatment. The following instances clearly bear this out.

P. 8.2.22. परेश्च घाङ्कयोः ।

Kātyāyana : सङि लत्वसलोपसंयोगादिलोपकुत्वदीर्घत्वानि । प्रयोजनं गिरौ गिरः पयो धावति द्विष्टराम् दृषत्स्थानम् काष्ठशक्स्थाता क्रुञ्चा घुर्यं इति ।

In the first Vārtika, Kātyāyana desires सङि to be read along with certain Sūtras in this Pāda enjoining लत्व etc. In the second, he enumerates the purposes for which it has to be read.

Patañjali : एतदपि नास्ति प्रयोजनम् । काष्ठशगेव नास्ति । कुतो यः काष्ठशकि तिष्ठेत् ॥

With reference to काष्टशक्स्थाता what Kātyāyana says is that if सङि is read along with P. 8.2.29 (स्कोः संयोगाद्योरन्ते च) the operation of that Sūtra will be restricted to instances which contain सङ् and the

99. Cf. अतिप्रसङ्ग इतिचेदभिधानलक्षणत्वात्प्रत्ययस्य सिद्धम् ।
(P. 3.3.19, V. 3) etc.

100. Cf. the Mahābhāṣya on P. 3.1.67 :
नैकमुदाहरणं योगारम्भं प्रयोजयति ॥

elision of क् can be avoided in this case. The word काष्ठशक् itself does not exist, says Patañjali, not to speak of a compound like काष्ठशक्स्थाता

Cf. also Patañjali on—

P. 1.1.24. यद्येवं प्रियाष्टौ प्रियाष्टा इति न सिध्यति। प्रियाष्ठानो प्रियाष्टान इति च प्राप्नोति। यथालक्षणमप्रयुक्ते ॥

P. 2.4.34. यद्येवमेनच्छ्रितको न सिध्यति। एनच्छ्रितक इति प्राप्नोति। यथालक्षमप्रयुक्ते।

P. 6.1.68. यद्येवं कीर्तयतेरप्रत्ययः कीरिति प्राप्नोति कीर्त् इति चेष्यते। यथालक्षणमप्रयुक्ते।

P. 6.1.86. यद्येवं वेडोऽप्रत्यये उरिति प्राप्नोति। उदिति चेष्यते। यथालक्षणमप्रयुक्ते।

P. 6.4.2. एवमपि कर्तृणा कर्तृचे अत्र न प्राप्नोति। यथालक्षणमप्रयुक्ते।

P. 6.4.19. तथा वाञ्छतेरप्रत्ययो वान् वांशौ वांश इति न सिध्यति। यथालक्षणमप्रयुक्ते।

P 6.4.163. पयिष्ठ इति न सिध्यति। पयसिष्ठ इति प्राप्नोति। यथालक्षणमप्रयुक्ते।

P. 7.2.106. द्व इति प्राप्नोति। स्व इति चेष्यते। यथालक्षणमप्रयुक्ते।

The commentators[101] of the Mahābhāṣya rightly explain यथालक्षणमप्रयुक्ते thus :

Kaiyaṭa : नैव वा लक्षणमप्रयुक्ते प्रवर्तते। प्रयुक्तानामेव लक्षणेनान्वाख्यानात्।

Nāgeśa : लक्षणस्याभावोऽलक्षणम्; तस्य योग्यता यथालक्षणमित्यव्ययीभावः। अप्रयुक्ते लक्षणाभावस्यैव योग्यता न तु लक्षणस्येत्यर्थः ॥

Here we have a clear exposition of Patañjali's lofty Realism. Vyākaraṇa is an Anuśāsana of Śabdas, an Anvākhyāna (Cf. अथ शब्दानुशासनम्). It deals with the existent and not with the imaginary; it is a means and not an end in itself. Says Bhartṛhari in Vākyapadīya:—

उपायाः शिक्षमाणानां बालानामुपलालनाः।
असत्ये वर्त्मनि स्थित्वा ततः सत्यं समीहते ॥

101. See the Pradīpa and the Udyota on P. 1.1.24, Vol. I, p. 285.

Kātyāyana very often entertains unreasonable fear and rushes to modify Pāṇini. His intention, it must be noted, is not to criticise Pāṇini, but to save the latter from becoming imperfect or faulty in some respect as supposed by him. On such occasions Patañjali brings it home to the Vārtikakārā that no grammar can trav rse the actual boundaries of the language with which it is concerned and that the fear entertained by him and the effort made to rectify Pāṇini are both needless and baseless.

The following are two instances illustrative of a host of others.

P. 4.3.120. तस्येदम् ।

Kātyāyana : अनन्तरादिषु च प्रतिषेधः ।

Patañjali explains : अनन्तरादिषु च प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः ।

तस्यानन्तरस्तस्य समीप इति । किं यद्योगा षष्ठी प्रवर्तते इत्यतोऽनन्तरादिषु प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । नेत्याह । सर्वथानन्तरादिषु प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः ॥

Refutes : यदप्युच्यतेऽनन्तरादिषु च प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्य इति न वक्तव्यः । अनभिधानादनन्तरादिषूत्पत्तिर्न भविष्यति ।

P. 4.4.83. विध्यत्यधनुषा ।

Kātyāyana : विध्यत्यकरणेन ।

Patañjali : विध्यत्यकरणेनेति वक्तव्यम् ?

Kātyāyana : इतरथा ह्यतिप्रसङ्गः ।

Patañjali explains : अधनुषेति ह्युच्यमानेऽतिप्रसङ्गो भवति । इहापि प्रसज्येत । शर्कराभिर्विध्यति । कण्टकैर्विध्यतीति ।

Refutes : तर्हि वक्तव्यम् । न वक्तव्यम् । कस्मान्न भवति शर्कराभिर्विध्यतीति कण्टकैर्विध्यतीति । अनभिधानात् ।

Later commentators—Lakṣaṇaikacakṣuṣkas

The later commentators sometimes lose themselves in the wilderness of theorization and dally with conjectural forms such as those derived from the addition of आचारक्विप् to कर्तरि क्विप् etc. The following instances are culled from Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's works, but

they have also the support of some other older commentators. Some of them, namely, काव्, कलत्, etc. are taken by him from the works[102] of his predecessors.

Nāgeśa, the greatest among the later grammarians, is the solitary exception. He reminds us very often in his works the necessity of sustaining Pāṇini's lofty realism. None who have taken the pains of studying his works closely will ever tire of praising him. It is very unfortunate that modern Oriental scholarship should have been slow to recognise fully the merit of this master-mind. The following exemplifies some later commentators' dry theorization and disgusting indulgence in nugae.

अत्रोच्यते । कुस्मयतेः कूरित्यादिसिद्धये संयोगादिति वाच्यमेव । किञ्च तक् रक् इत्याद्यर्थमपि वक्तव्यम् । न चानभिधानं प्रमाणाभावात् । कैयटादिभिरुदाहृतत्वाच्च ।

तक्षयतेः क्विपि तक् ।
रक्षयतेस्तु रक् ।
स्कदन्यतेः स्कन् ।

(Śabdakaustubha, Vol. I, pp. 308 and 309).

काव्यं कलत्रं शाल्वं चाचक्षाणः काव् कलत् शाल् । अदभ्रयतेरधब् ॥

(Prauḍhamanoramā, Part I, p. 98)

शष्क्युः पक्युः, शुष्क्यः, पक्यः ॥

(Ibid. Part I. p. 145)

पन्थानमात्मन इच्छति पथीयति । ततः क्विप् अलोपः यल्लोपः । एकदेशविकृतस्यानन्यत्वात् पथिमथीत्यात्वम् । थोन्थः पन्थाः ॥

Ibid. Part I, p. 384

Bhaṭṭoji gives twenty-eight forms of the Sandhi of उ and इति (P. 145, P. 8.3.33 मय उञो वो वा) and one hundred and eight forms of संस्कर्ता (Siddh. Kaum. P. 8.3.34). Again in the chapter on the declension of neuters ending in consonants of the same work he has:

गवाक्शब्दस्य रूपाणि क्लीबेऽर्चागतिभेदतः ।[103]
असन्ध्यवाङ्पूर्वरूपैर्नवाधिकशतं मतम् ॥

---

102. Prakriyākaumudī, etc.
103. Cf. Patañjali on P. 7.1.72 :
व्यञ्जनपरस्यैकस्यानेकस्य वोच्चारणे विशेषाभावः ।

स्वम्सुप्सु नव षड्भादौ षट्के स्युस्त्रीणि जश्शसोः ।
चत्वारि शेषे दशकं रूपाणीति विभावय ॥
ऊह्यमेषां द्विर्वचनानुनासिकविकल्पनात् ।
रूपाण्यश्वाक्षिभूतानि(527)भवन्तीति मनीषिभिः ॥

Five hundred and twenty-seven forms of a Sandhi are given here.

These forms have to be searched for elsewhere than in the range (the Earth with its seven continents, etc., etc.,) described by Patañjali. Even if they are found used by some later writers after the example of these grammarians, it is no genuine proof of their having been in vogue. If our approach to Pāṇini's grammar is strictly historical and if we examine these words with an open mind, we cannot but observe that some of these later commentators have in this respect fallen short of the high ideal set up by Pāṇini and Patañjali.

Let us remember what Patañjali says in Paspaśā :

ये पुनः कार्या भावा निर्वृत्तौ तावत्तेषां यत्नः क्रियते । तद्यथा—घटेन कार्यं करिष्यन् कुम्भकारकुलं गत्वाह-कुरु घटं कार्यमनेन करिष्यामीति । न तद्वच्छब्दान् प्रयुयुक्षमाणो वैयाकरणकुलं गत्वाह-कुरु शब्दान् प्रयोक्ष्य इति ।

(pp. 7-8)

As against what we find in the works of some commentators referred to above. Nāgeśa's following statements may be noted. He follows Patañjali and discards the wild theorization of some of his predecessors.

परे तु न पदान्ता हलोऽणः सन्तीति लण् सूत्रस्थभाष्याद्वृक्षवादेरनभिधानमेव । भो भगो इति सूत्रेऽश्ग्रहणमनर्थकमन्यत्राभावादिति वार्तिकाच्च । अशोऽन्यत्र तन्निमित्तकार्यिणोऽभावादिति तदर्थः । न ह्यन्यत्र रुरस्तीति तद्व्याख्यानभाष्ये रुग्रहणमुपलक्षणम्................॥[104]

(Laghuśabdenduśekhara, Part I, P. 149).

क्विपस्त्वादन्तेभ्यो भाष्यानुक्तक्विब्भ्योऽनभिधानमेव ॥ (P. 364)
एवं च साशब्दादेः यद्यभिधानम्............... ॥ (P. 365)

104. See also p. 456.
All references are to the Laghuśabdenduśekhara, Part I., Kashi Sanskrit Series.

आचारक्विबन्तप्रकृतिककर्तृक्विबन्तस्य भाष्ये क्वाप्नुपन्यासेन तेभ्यः कर्तृक्विपोऽनभिधानस्यैव लाभाच्च ॥ (pp. 366 and 367)

इतरसूत्रविषयोदाहरणाभिधानम् ॥ (p. 413)

अधिकरणे क्यच् तु नास्त्येव अनभिधानात् ॥ (p. 460)

मघवन् शब्दस्य लोकेऽसाधुत्वम् ॥ (p. 468)

एतेन पथोयतेः क्विपि पन्था इत्यादीत्यपास्तम् ॥ (p. 473)

नैव वा लक्षणमप्रयुक्ते प्रवर्तते प्रयुक्तानामेव लक्षणेनान्वाख्यानादित्यन्त्य-व्याख्यानमेव ज्यायः ॥ (p. 473)

Instances illustrating both sides may be multiplied.

Resume

We have thus examined in this and the previous chapters the background of Kātyāyana's and Patañjali's works, their approaches to grammar, the influence or influences which prevailed on them, the respective positions taken up by them and the extent to which they were followed by later commentators.

In the next, it is proposed to correlate the historical[105] side of the Mahābhāṣya to some important linguistic changes which mostly took place in the interval between Kātyāyana and Patañjali and which enable us to know the real state of the language at the time of the composition of the great commentary.

---

105. Vedic instance excepted for this purpose; only a few of them will be given to point out how Patañjali also fills the gap in the treatment of the Vedic language by Pāṇini.

CHAPTER IV

Patañjali and the linguistic changes

"To show in detail the differences between Kātyāyana and Patañjali would be a task full of interest and highly instructive, as showing the progress which the science of grammar had undoubtedly made from the time of Kātyāyana to that of Patañjali, and as tracing in the work of the latter the germs of those failings which have continued growing and increasing in the works of the later grammarians ever since. But that task does not lie within the scope of this enquiry, nor would the materials at my command justify my undertaking it at present. My purpose is attained if in future it will be impossible to stigmatize Kātyāyana as an unfair antagonist of Pāṇini, and to speak of Patañjali as refuting the Vārtika of Kātyāyana, or justifying Pāṇini."

So wrote Kielhorn concluding his very learned essay on Kātyāyana and Patañjali (Bombay 1876). After him textual research in Pāṇini for long remained where he had left it. Here I propose to show the "Progress which the science of grammar had undoubtedly made from the time of Kātyāyana to that of Patañjali." What I have said in regard to the nature and scope of my enquiry into the Kātyāyana Vārtikas applies to this also. Patañjali's aim is not to defend Pāṇini but to bring the work of his (Patañjali's) predecessors up to date.

Pāṇini 1. 1. 29. This Sūtra says that the words 'Sarva' etc. not treated as Sarvanāmans when they are intended to be employed in a Bahuvrīhi compound. The object of this prohibition is to avoid the affix अकच् taught by P. 5. 3. 71 and to have the ordinary affix क taught by P. 5. 3. 70. Accordingly Pāṇini has the forms त्वत्कपितृकः and मत्कपितृकः. Kātyāyana does not differ from Pāṇini. But Patañjali accepts the forms त्वकत्पितृकः and मकत्पितृकः (अकच is inserted before टि) and rejects this Sūtra.

1. 3. 25. The verb 'Sthā' preceded by 'upa', takes the Ātmanepada terminations in two more instances in Patañjali's time

(i) when it means Mitrakaraṇa (to form friendship with) and (ii) Pathi (to lead to as a way).

E. g., रथिकानुपतिष्ठते । पन्थाः स्रुघ्नमुपतिष्ठते ॥

1. 3. 51. Pāṇini teaches the use of the root 'gṛ' (Tudādi) in Atmanepada when it is preceeded by the Upasarga 'ava'. Kātyāyana emends this Sūtra into अवाद्ग्रो गिरते: to exclude 'gṛṇāti' belonging to the Kryādi class. According to Patañjali, the latter is not used after the preposition 'ava' and there is no need for the emendation.

1. 3. 64. Pāṇini says that the root 'yuj' with the Upasargas 'pra' and 'upa' is conjugated in the Ātmanepada when it is not used in reference to sacrificial vessels. Patañjali introducing the modification "स्वराद्युपसृष्टादिति वक्तव्यम्" says that this verb takes the Ātmanepada terminations when it is combined with any preposition beginning with a vowel. He then gives the opinion of another grammarian according to whom the Ātmanepada is employed when the Upasarga begins or ends with a vowel.

अपर आह—स्वराद्यन्तोपसृष्टादिति वक्तव्यम् ।

The latter includes all Upasargas except 'sam', 'nir' and 'dur'. From these two statements two more post-Pāṇinian stages may be recognised in the extension of the Ātmanepada in the case of 'yuj' used with Upasargas, (i) one represented by Patañjali and (ii) the other by the grammarian referred to by him.

1. 4. 17. Patañjali extends Padasaṃjñā to two more words, namely मुवद्वद्भ्य: and धारयद्वद्भ्य:

1. 4. 51. Pāṇini and Kātyāyana speak only of Karma. Kalma defined in the following Ślokavārtika (quoted by Patañjali from some earlier works), is a much later idea.

विपरीतं तु यत्कर्म तत्कल्म कवयो विदुः ।
अपरिसमाप्तं कर्म कल्म (imperfect action).

2. In the end of his commentary on this Sūtra, Patañjali, gives us two forms allowing an option in the use of the accusative case in the following case.

नेताश्वस्य स्रुघ्नम् । नेताश्वस्य स्रुघ्नस्य ।

The former must have been the earlier usage and the latter must have come in vogue when the use of the genitive case was liberalised later to a large extent.

1. 4. 20. Pāṇini in this Sūtra says that the Vedic words like ayasmaya, etc., are treated as 'Bha'. But there are irregularities in the Veda and some words have to be treated as both Pada and Bha.

Patañjali : [106]उभयसंज्ञान्यपीति वक्तव्यम् ।

For instance, the Vedic word 'ṛkvata' (R. V. IV. 50. 5) is first treated as Pada to change च् to क् and then as Bha to avoid the change of क् to ग् before 'vat'.

2. 1. 37. The optional compounding of a word ending with the fifth case affix is allowed by Patañjali with morewords, namely, bhīta, bhīti, bhī,, nirgata and jugupsu. Pāṇini gives only one, namely, bhaya.

2. 2. 18. (i) The Vārtika प्रादयः क्तार्थे says that Upasargas like pra etc. are compounded with a word ending with the first case affix.

E,g., प्रगत आचार्यः प्राचार्यः ।

Patañjali informs us that the Saunāgas have the following list.

स्वती पूजायाम् । सुराजा । अतिराजा ।
दुर्निन्दायाम् । दुष्कुलम् । दुर्गवः ।
आङीषदर्थे । आकडारः । आपिङ्गलः ।
कुः पापार्थे । कुब्राह्मणः । कुवृषलः ।
प्रादयो गताद्यर्थे प्रथमया । प्राचार्यः ।
अत्यादयः क्रान्ताद्यर्थे द्वितीयया । अतिखट्वः । अतिमालः ।
अवादयः क्रुष्टाद्यर्थे तृतीयया । अवकोकिलः ।
पर्यादयो ग्लानाद्यर्थे चतुर्थ्या । पर्यध्ययनः ।
निरादयः क्रान्ताद्यर्थे पञ्चम्या । निष्कौशाम्बिः ।

(ii) Patañjali gives the following three types of compounds also under this Sūtra.

---

106. See also Patañjali on 8. 2. 8.

(a) An Avyaya (indeclinable) is compounded with words like pravṛddha etc., e. g., punaḥ-pravṛddham.

(b) It is compounded with a Tiṅanta word ending with a tense affix and preceded by a 'Gati', e. g., anuvyacalat.

(c) A word is compounded with 'iva' retaining its case-affix and original accent, e. g., vāsasī-iva.

The inclusion of these three types among compounds was a later event and was probably to safeguard the position of the accent of the first member.

3. 1. 16. Patañjali extends the use of the affix क्यङ् (in the sense of ejecting) to one more word, namely, phenāyate.

3. 1. 17. Patañjali includes the following words among those that take the affix, क्यङ्,

अटा अटायते । अट्टा अट्टायते । शीका शीकायते ।
कोटा कोटायते । पोटा पोटायते । सोटा सोटायते ।
प्रुष्टा प्रुष्टायते । प्लुष्टा प्लुष्टायते ।

In all probability, these are onomatopoetic sounds which crept into the language after Pāṇini and Kātyāyana.

3. 1. 22. In Pāṇini's[107] language the intensive affix यङ् was confined to monosyllabic roots beginning with a consonant. Kātyāyana, as we have seen above, extended it to 'ūrṇu', a dissyllabic root beginning with a vowel. In Patañjali's language the following roots also take the affix यङ्. Some of them are not monosyllabic and others do not begin with a vowel.

अशि अशाश्यते । सूचि सोसूच्यते । सूत्रि सोसूत्र्यते ।
मूत्रि मोमूत्र्यते । अटि अटाट्यते । अर्ति अरार्यते ।।

2. 3. 2. Patañjali gives the following words as governing the accusative case.

Abhitaḥ, paritaḥ, adhyadhi, dhik, ubhayataḥ, sarvataḥ, uparyupari, adhodhaḥ and pratiḥ.

---

107. Cf. P. 3. 1. 22.

2. 3. 43. Pāṇini excepts only 'prati' when he says that the seventh case-affix is employed in conjunction with the words sādhu and nipuṇa. Patañjali applies this exception to some other words also. Says he : अप्रत्यादिभिरिति वक्तव्यम् । मातरमनु ।

2. 4. 30. Some Dvigu compounds were given option in taking genders in Kātyāyana's time. Under this Sūtra Kātyāyana has the Vārtikas द्विगुश्च । वाबन्तः ।

When we come to Patañjali we see that this latitude is extended to other Dvigu compounds also. Compounds like pañcatakṣan etc. whose second member is formed with the affix 'an' may be neuter and feminine.

Pañca-takṣam[108] or pañca-takṣī.

The use of some compounds like pañca-pātra in feminine is also prohibited. Says he :

पात्रादिभ्यः प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । द्विपात्रम् । पञ्चपात्रम् ।

2. 4. 74. This Sūtra enjoins the elision of यङ् when अच् (P. 3. 1. 134) and other affixes follow :

E. g., लोलुवः पोपुवः etc.

Among the words thus derived from the intensives, two seem to have changed their forms in the interval between Kātyāyana and Patañjali. According to Kātyāyana, the forms derived from 'sraṃs' (to drop) and 'dhvaṃs' (to fill) are 'sanīsrasa'[109] and 'danīdhvasa' respectively; according to Patañjali, they are sanīsraṃsa and danīdhvaṃsa.

Patañjali :[110] इष्टमेवैतत् संगृहीतम्-सनीस्रंसो दनीध्वंस इत्येव भवितव्यम् ॥

3. 1. 27. The roots of the Kaṇḍvādi group in reference to which Pāṇini enjoins the affix 'yak' in this Sūtra, occur also as nouns. There is no reliable evidence to ascertain exactly their original nature. We have to be satisfied with the inference that can be drawn from the works of our grammarians. 'Kaṇḍū' does not occur in the Ṛgveda either as a root or as a noun. Kaṇḍūyate is

108. 'N' of the affix 'an' is dropped in the compound.
109. See P. 6. 4. 24, 48-49 and P. 1. 1. 62.
110. See Kātyāyana and Patañjali on this Sūtra.

seen in the Taittirīya Saṃhitā (6. 1. 3. 8. and 7. 1. 19. 3) and in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (3. 2. 1. 31). Irajyati and bhuraṇyati (belong to this group), occur in the (R. V. 1. 7. 9., 8. 41. 9, and 1. 155. 5.) besides irajyavaḥ (R. V. 10. 93. 3.) and bhuraṇyuḥ (R. V. 1. 68. 1) etc.

Pāṇini has not expressly given his view, but the fact that he attaches the Anubandha 'k' to the above affix (yak) to[111] prevent the operation of Guṇa when the root is followed by a Sārvadhātuka[112] or Ārdhadhātuka affix, shows that he regards them as roots. This view is also confirmed by the following Kātyāyana Vārtikas in which the discussion has proceeded on the assumption that they are only roots. The nouns kaṇḍū etc., were, of course, current even before Kātyāyana or Pāṇini. But they were regarded as Kṛdantas formed by the affix 'kvip'.

Kātyāyana : कण्ड्वादिभ्यो वावचनम् ।
Patañjali : कण्ड्वादिभ्यो वेति वक्तव्यम् ॥
Kātyāyana : अवचने हि नित्यप्रत्ययत्वम् ॥
Patañjali ; अक्रियमाणे हि वावचने नित्यः प्रत्ययविधिः प्रसज्येत ।
तत्र को दोषः ?
Kātyāyana : तत्र धातुविधितुक्प्रतिषेधः ।
Patañjali : तत्र धातुविधेस्तुकश्च प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः स्यात् ।
कण्ड्वौ कण्ड्वः (6.4.72) अचि नुश्धातुभ्रुवां य्वोरियङुवङौ इत्युवङादेशः प्रसज्येत । तुक्च प्रतिषेद्धव्यः । वल्गुः मन्तुरिति । ह्रस्वयस्य पिति कृति तुक्प्राप्नोति ॥
Kātyāyana : ह्रस्वलोपौ च ॥
Patañjali : ह्रस्वयलोपौ च वक्तव्यौ स्याताम् । वल्गुः मन्तुरिति । किमर्थमिदं न ह्रस्व एवायमन्तरङ्गत्वात् । अकृद्यकार इति दीर्घत्वं प्राप्नोति ॥

From this it is clear that according to Kātyāyana, words like kaṇḍū etc. are derived from the respective roots with the Kṛt affix क्विप्, i.e., they are derivative words and not Avyutpannapratipadikas.

---

111. क्ङिति च P. 1.1.5.
112. Affixes which come after roots and not after Prātipadikas are called Sārvadhātuka and Ārdhadhatuka.

Like many other Ākṛtigaṇas Kaṇḍvādi, too, has had later addition of words[113] which had been only nouns (Avyutpannaprātipadikas) in Pāṇini's language.

Cf. Uṣasyati, tirasyati, sambhūyasyati, magadhyati, etc. In Pāṇini's language the affix 'yak' was employed in Svārtha. It did not stand for any specific significance apart from that of the root. To Pāṇini kaṇḍūyate meant only कण्डूर्भवति. But a semantic change is noticeable in the days of Durga.

Vardhamāna says[114] : पाणिनिशकटाङ्गजदिग्वस्त्रवामनमतेन स्वार्थे कण्ड्वावादिभ्यः प्रत्ययः । चन्द्रादीनां मते करोत्यर्थे ॥

Patañjali's view.

Patañjali rejects the above Vārtikas as follows :

तर्हि वावचनं कर्तव्यम् न कर्तव्यम् । उभयं कण्ड्वावादीनि धातवश्चैव प्रातिपादिकनि च । आतश्चोभयम्-कण्डूयतीति क्रियां कुर्वाणे प्रयुज्यते । अस्ति मे कण्डूरिति वेदनामात्रस्य सांनिध्ये ।

अपर आह—

धातुप्रकरणाद्धातुः कस्य चासञ्चनादपि ।
आह चायमिमं दीर्घमन्ये धातुर्विभाषितः ।

3. 1. 35. Pāṇini in this Sūtra says that the affix 'ām' is added to the root 'kās' (to cough) and to those roots which are formed by the affixes (the derivative verbs), in the Perfect (Lit); but not in the Vedas. It has already been pointed out that the sphere of the periphrastic 'ām' was gradually widened. Patañjali substitutes the word anekācaḥ in the room of pratyayāt and the Perfect of all polysyllabic roots is formed periphrastically in his language.

Patañjali : एवं तर्हि कास्यनेकाच इति वक्तव्यम् । किं प्रयोजनम् । चुलुम्पाद्यर्थम् । चुलुम्पांचकार । दरिद्रांचकार ॥

3. 1. 36. According to this Sūtra, the periphrastic 'ām' is used in the Perfect of roots beginning with Ic (vowels except 'a'

113. See Gaṇaratnamahodadhi, 437, 438 and 439 and the author's commentary thereon.

114. Ibid, 439.

and 'ā') and containing a heavy vowel, except ṛccha. Kātyāyana applies prohibition to ūrṇu' also. Patañjali points out that the prohibition with regard to ūrṇu need not be stated, as it (ūrṇu) has to be treated as 'ṇu' (monosyllabic) even for other purposes, namely, to[115] enable it to take the intensive affix and to avoid the insertion of 'iṭ'.

[116]उर्णोतेश्चोपसंख्यानं कर्तव्यम् । प्रोर्णुनाव । न वक्तव्यम् ।
वाच्य ऊर्णोर्णुवद्भावो यङ्प्रसिद्धिः प्रयोजनम् ।
आमश्च प्रतिषेधार्थमेकाचश्चेडुपग्रहात् ॥

3.1.89. Pāṇini prohibits the affixes 'yak' (3.1.67) and 'ciṇ' (3.1.62) in the reflexive voice of the verbs 'duh' (to milk) 'snu' (to fall in drops) and 'nam' (to bow), e.g., adugdha, prāsnoṣṭa, anaṃsta.

Kātyāyana applies the prohibition to two other roots, namely, śri and brūñ and to all causatives (हेतुमण्णिच्).

Kātyāyana : यक्चिणोः प्रतिषेधे हेतुमण्णिश्रिब्रूञामुपसंख्यानम् ।

The Bhāradvājīyas, according to Patañjali, have the following Vārtika.

यक्चिणोः प्रतिषेधे णिश्रन्थिग्रन्थिब्रूञात्मनेपदाकर्मकाणामुपसंख्यानम् ।

In cases like this,[117] there exists internal evidence to show that the author of the Bhāradvāja Vārtikas flourished long after Kātyāyana.

3.1.97. The suffix 'yat' ordained by this Sūtra was in Pāṇini's language confined to roots ending in a vowel, e. g. गेयम्, पेयम्, चेयम्, etc.

The word janya is derived by Kātyāyana with this affix from the root 'jan' which ends in a consonant. We would have got the form janya even by the affix ṇyat enjoined by P. 3.1.24; but it is for the sake of the accent taught by P. 6.1.213 that the Vārtika gives 'yat' instead of ṇyat. The accent of ṇyat is regulated by P. 6.1.185.

115. See P. 3. 1. 22 and 7. 2. 11.
116. See also Patañjali on 3.1.22.
117. See also Patañjali on 1.1,20 and 6.4.155.

Kātyāyana : यति जनेरुपसंख्यानम् ।

Patañjali has some more roots ending in a consonant to be enumerated in addition to those given by his predecessors.

अत्यल्पमिदमुच्यते । तकिशासिचतियतिजनीनामुपसंख्यानमिति वक्तव्यम् ।
तक्यम्, शस्यम्, चत्यम्, यत्यम्, जन्यम् ।

3.2.24. Under this Sūtra we have the supplementary note.

स्तम्बशकृतोर्व्रीहिवत्सयोः printed as a Kātyāyana Vārtika in Kielhorn's edition. It has to be pointed out that Patañjali is a very systematic grammarian and in commenting upon the Vārtikas of different authors, he adopts different methods which in themselves are strictly uniform. He maintains uniformity even in statements of his own opinions, which though appear like repetitions to a casual reader, have their own definite purpose to serve. The wise grammarian has left this safe clue for us. He does not usually comment upon a Kātyāyana Vārtika without repeating the same, For instance.

Kātyāyana	कियत्तद्बहुषु कृञोऽज्विधानम् ।	3. 2. 21 (1)
Patañjali	कियत्तद्बहुषु कृञोऽज्विधानं कर्तव्यम् ।	
Kātyāyana	भृञः कुक्ष्यात्मनोर्मुम्च ।	3. 2. 26 (1)
Patañjali	भृञः कुक्ष्यात्मनोर्मुम्चेति वक्तव्यम् ।	

On the other hand, Patañjali's comment on the Vārtika under discussion is only व्रीहिवत्सयोरिति वक्तव्यम् । If the above Vārtika were Kātyāyana's, Patañjali would have paraphrased it in his usual way as : स्तम्बशकृतोरित्यत्र व्रीहिवत्सयोरिति वक्तव्यम् ।

The Benares edition of the Mahābhāṣya contains exactly this comment. Some old manuscripts[118] consulted by me support Kielhorn's reading and the reading given by the Benares edition does not seem to be a correct one.

3.2.29. A note has been added above on this Sūtra and on the Vārtika and Bhāṣya on it.

---

118. Adyar Library Ms. 8.1.22 Vol. 3, p. 45, etc.

3.2.48. In Patañjali's language, the root 'gam' takes the affix 'ḍa' when in composition with words other than those given by Pāṇini and Kātyāyna.

Patañjali अपर आह । डप्रकरणेऽन्येष्वपि दृश्यते । अन्येष्वपि डो भवतीति वक्तव्यम् ।

3.2.80. EKĀRTHĪBHĀVASĀMARTHYA

Ekārthībhāva is unity of sense. The compound as one word expresses one meaning. The component parts, i. e., the words of a compound, are so inseparably united together for the expression of one meaning that it is not possible to connect the meaning of any one of them with that of a word which is not directly compounded with them or is outside the compound. None of them convey their own independent meanings, but each one only stands for the meaning of the compound. This[119] kind of capability of the words in a Samāsa is called the Ekārthībhāvasāmarthya.

The principle of Yugapadadhikaraṇavacanatā (युगपदाधिकरण-वचनता) advocated by Kātyāyana in Dvandva compounds was a logical consequence of this Ekārthībhāva. Kātyāyana points out that in the compound plakṣanyagrodhau, both plakṣa and nyagrodha have the same[120] meaning, i. e., plakṣa means both plakṣa and nyagrodha, and nyagrodha means both nyagrodha and plakṣa. This is clearly brought out by the Vārtikas and the Mahābhāṣya on P. 2.2.29 (चार्थे द्वन्द्व).

Both Pāṇini and Kātyāyana held the Ekārthībhāvasāmarthya to be the sine que non of all compounds. Rules relating to complete words, says Pāṇini in 2.1.1, (समर्थः पदविधिः), must be understood as applying only to Samartha words. In his commentary on P. 3.2.80, Patañjali points out that in certain compounds which have the negative particle for their first member, the above condition has been dispensed with.

---

119. See Bālamanoramā, Vol. I. p. 467; Laghusiddhāntamañjūṣā, Vṛttivicāra, pp. 1372-1422; Bhūṣanasāra Samāsaśaktinirṇaya, pp. 206-246; also Kātyāyana and Patañjali on P. 2.1.1. (Vol. 1-4)

120. See Kātyāyana and Patañjali on P. 2.2.29 (V. 9)

[121]स तर्ह्यसमर्थसमासो वक्तव्यः । यद्यपि वक्तव्योऽथवैतर्हि बहूनि प्रयोजनानि । कानि । असूर्यंपश्यानि[122]मुखानि । अपुनर्गेयाः श्लोकाः । (3.2.80)

He is also not inclined to accept the doctrine of Yugapadadhikaraṇavacanatā propounded by Kātyāyana. Says he :

इयं युगपदधिकरणवचनता नाम दुःखा च दुरुपपादा च ॥
P. 2.2.29 (Vol. I. p. 434)

3.2.174. Pāṇini gives two words, namely, bhīru and bhīluka, formed with the affixes 'knu' and 'klukan' respectively. Patañjali gives a third one with the affix 'krukan' – bhīruka.

3.3.17. Patañjali adds atīsāra, visāra, śālakāra, khadirasāra, etc. These are not covered by the Sūtra.

3.3.56. The affix 'ac' is extended to some more roots by Patañjali and we have words like varṣam, etc. Pāṇini enjoins it only after roots ending in 'i', short or long. It is not quite clear why he omitted varṣam, etc.

3.3.101 Pāṇini gives the word icchā as a nipāta, i.e., a word irregularly formed. Patañjali has to add many more. Says he;

अत्यल्पमिदमुच्यते इच्छेति । इच्छापरिचर्यापरिसर्यामृगयाटाट्यानां निपातनं कर्तव्यम् । जागर्तेराकारो वा जागर्या जागरा ॥

3.3.113 Pāṇini points out the irregularity in the application of the affixes called kṛtya and that of lyuṭ (कृत्यल्युटो बहुलम्). Patañjali substitutes kṛtya by kṛt[123] so that the diversity in some instances like those referred to by Patañjali under this Sūtra may also be explained.

3.3.125 Pāṇini has given only two words, viz, ākhana; and ākhāna; but Patañjali gives ākha, ākhara, ākhanika and ākhaṇikavaka

---

121. Cf. also तस्मान्नार्थः समर्थग्रहणेन 2.1.1.
122. Here it must be noted that in असूर्यंपश्य the direct Anvaya of नञ् is only with the verb पश्य and not with सूर्य or even with सूर्यंपश्य if the latter is taken as a whole. The vigrahavākya is सूर्यं न पश्यति; hence there is no Sāmarthya between the two.
123. Kṛt is a general term.

3.3.130 To the list of words accounted for by the Sūtrakāra and the Vārtikakāra, the Bhāyṣakāra adds durmarṣaṇa too.

In Patañjali's language a good deal of diversity has set in in the application of the feminine affixes. The Bhāṣyakāra has to restrict, modify and widen the scope of a large number of Sūtras dealing with them. Instances are : P. 4.1.7, 4.1.15, 4.1.20, 4.1.31, 4.1.32, 4.1.48, 4.1.63, 4.1.64, 4.1.70, 4.1.71 and 4.1.74. This is more so in the case of the taddhitas. A great number of new words crop up in Patañjali's language. Some words undergo semantic changes also. The Mahābhāṣya on the following Sūtras deals fully with them.

4.1.97; 4.1.168; 4.2.7; 4.2.39; 4.2.40; 4.2.43; 4.2.60; 4.2.87 : 4.2.95; 4.2.99; 4.2.129; 4.3.23; 4.3.60; 4.4.17; 5.1.10; 5.2.33; 5.2.37 5.2.107; 5.2.109; 5.2.122; 5.2.125; 5.2.129; 5.4.30; 5.4.36; 5.4.67 5.4.78; 5.4.118; and 5.4.119.

6.1.144. The 'm' of tumun is elided before 'manas' also according to Patañjali, e.g., bhoktumanāḥ, samanāḥ, etc.

6.2.199. On this Sūtra we have an important kārikā by Patañjali which points out the diversity in the accentuation of compounds and gives us a glimpse into the history of the various stages through which it (accentuation of the compounds) has passed.

पराদिश्च परान्तश्च पूर्वान्तश्चापि दृश्यते ।
पूर्वादयश्च दृश्यन्ते व्यत्ययो बहुलं स्मृतः ॥

6.3.23. Pāṇini says that the genitive affix is not elided after a word ending in 'ṛ' and expressing a relationship through study or blood. According to Kātyāyana, the two members of the compounds must be such as to express the same kind of relationship. Kātyāyana, therefore, does not have compounds like hotuḥputraḥ, etc., in which the relationship expressed by the first member differs from that expressed by the second. When we come to the Mahābhāṣya no such restriction is maintained. Patañjali says :

अथैतेषां व्यतिकरेण भवितव्यम्? वाढं भवितव्यम् । होतुः पुत्रः । पितुरन्तेवासी ।

6.3.56. The substitution of pāda by pad becomes optional before niṣka also.

Patañjali : निष्के चोपसंख्यानं कर्तव्यम् । पन्निष्केण । पादनिष्केण ।

6.3.61. Under this rule which enjoins the substitution of a long vowel by a short one before the second member of the compound, Patañjali, after instancing bhrukuṃsa, bhrukuṭi, etc., refers to the following Vārtika of another grammarian according to whom the 'ū' of bhrū is replaced in these compounds by 'a'. These may be instances of dissimilation of vowels.

Patañjali :

अपर आह । अकारो भ्रूकुंसादीनामिति वक्तव्यम् । भ्रकुटि: । भ्रकुंसः ।

6.3.70. In addition to the words given by Kātyāyana as taking in the augment mum, Patañjali gives timiṅgalagilaḥ.

6.3.121–122. By the insertion of ādi, etc., in both these rules, the Mahābhāṣya excludes the words rucivaham, cāruvaham (6 3.121) prasevaḥ, prahāraḥ, prasāraḥ, etc., from their scope.

6. 4. 40. The elision of the nasal of 'gam' before 'kvi' is taught in this Sūtra. According to Patañjali, the elision is seen in some other roots also. Says he ;

गमादीनामिति वक्तव्यम् । परीतत् । संयत् । सुनत् ॥

These roots take the affix ūṅ and the nasal is elided before that also, e. g., agregūḥ, bhrūḥ, etc.

6.4.84. The prohibition of uvaṅ has to be extended by Patañjali to two more words, viz., karabhūḥ and dṛṅbhūḥ.

6. 4. 114. According to this Sūtra, the final of daridrā is replaced by 'i' before a Sārvadhātuka beginning with a consonant, e. g., didaridriṣati. Kātyāyana adds :

दरिद्रातेरार्धधातुके लोपः ।

i. e., it is (the final of daridrā) dropped when followed by an Ārdhadhātuka. The affix 'ṇa' which comes after the roots ending in 'ā' (P. 3. 1. 141) is not thus added to this root, but the affix 'ac' (3. 1. 134 and 7. 3. 33) which gives daridraḥ (दरिद्रातीति दरिद्रः).

According to Patañjali, the desiderative of this root may be either didaridrāsati or didaridriṣati. As regards the Vārtika दरिद्रातेरार्धधातुके लोप : he points out that there is no elision in the forms daridrāyaka and daridrāṇa.

न दरिद्रायके लोपो दरिद्राणे च नेष्यते ।
दिदरिद्रासतीत्येके दिदरिद्रिषतीति वा ॥

6. 4. 127. This rule substitutes the final of arvan by tṛ when it is not followed by su or is not compounded with the negative particle. The substitution of the final of maghavan by the same 'tṛ' is taught in the next Sūtra. Pāṇini gives these as general rules, i.e., without confining them either to bhāṣā or to Chandas. But in Patañjali's language forms with 'tṛ' come to be regarded as Vedic, i.e., obsolete in the spoken language. Says he ;

अर्वणस्तृ मघोनश्च न शिष्यं छान्दसं हि तत् ।
मतुब्वन्योर्विधानाच्च छन्दस्युभयदर्शनात् ॥

7. 1. 51. Pāṇini says that the asuk which is added to aśva, kṣīra, etc., before the denominative kyac denotes the delight of the subjects in these things, e. g., aśvasyati, kṣīrasyati, etc. Kātyāyana introduces the following modifications.

अश्ववृषयोर्मैथुनेच्छायाम् ।
क्षीरलवणयोर्लालसायाम् ।

In Vārtikakāra's time it means 'desire for sexual connection' in aśvasyati and vṛṣasyati, and 'yearning for' in kṣīrasyati and lavaṇasyati. When we come to Patañjali we see not only that asuk is extended to all nominal stems in the sense of lālasā, but also that a new augment, namely, suk has come to be used beside.

Patañjali :

अपर आह । सर्वप्रातिपदिकेभ्यो लालसायामिति वक्तव्यम् । अपर आह-सुग्वक्तव्यः ॥

7. 2. 29. The meaning of this Sūtra is that the augment 'iṭ' is optionally prefixed to the participial affix 'ta' after the root hṛṣ when used in connection with loman, e.g..

हृष्टानि लोमानि । हृषितानि लोमानि ।

Patañjali extends the option to instances conveying two other senses also, namely, vismita and pratighāta.

विस्मितप्रतिघातयोरिति वक्तव्यम् । हृष्टो देवदत्तः । हृषितो देवदत्तः । हृष्टा दन्ताः । हृषिता दन्ताः ।

7. 3. 34. In prohibiting Vṛddhi before the Aorist ciṇ and the kṛt affixes having the anubandha 'ñ' or 'ṇ' with regard to roots ending in 'm' and bearing the Udātta accent. Pāṇini excludes only 'cam' with the preposition 'ā'; but Patañjali excludes 'vam' and 'kam' also, e.g., vāmaḥ and ācamaḥ.

7. 3. 45. Patañjali emends नयासयोः into नयत्तदोः and says : इहापि यथा स्यात् यकां यकामधीते । तकां तकां पचामहे । So the 'a' of either is not subtituted by 'I'. The Sūtra as it is will confine the prohibition to the 'a' of 'yā' and 'sā'

7.3.69. Pāṇini says the 'j' of bhojya does not change to the guttural (g) when it means Bhakṣya, i.e., any solid eatable. Kātyāyana wants to extend the use of this term even to liquid eatables; hence he substitutes abhyavahārye for bhakṣya; but Patañjali sees no difficulty even with bhakṣya; according to him, bhakṣya need not necessarily mean Kharaviśada only but like abhyavahārya, it means anything (solid or liquid) that is eatable. We can thus recognise three stages in the use of this word. In Pāṇini's language bhojya denoted only hard eatables. In Kātyāyana's, it denotes even liquid preparations like Sūpa. But the meaning of bhakṣya has not yet been extended in his time. When we come to Patañjali bhakṣya also acquires a wider significance. Patañjali instances the words abbhakṣaḥ (one who lives only on water) and vāyubhakṣaḥ (one who lives only on air).

7.3.107. Pāṇini teaches the shortening of 'ā' in the vocative of words synonymous with 'ambā'. A later commentator feels the necessity of excluding ambāḍe, ambāle and ambike (which are synonymous with ambā) from the scope of this rule and for this purpose he has the Vārtika उलकवतीनां प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः . Patañjali gets

these excluded otherwise; by ambārtha (in अम्बार्थनद्योर्ह्रस्वः) he understands not only synonymity but also equality in the number of syllables contained. The above words (ambāḍe etc.) consist of three syllables each and hence they do not come within the scope of this Sūtra.

Patañjali :

स तर्हि प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः ? न वक्तव्यः । स कथं न वक्तव्यो भवति ? अम्बार्थं द्व्यक्षरं यदि । यद्यम्बार्थं द्व्यक्षरं गृह्यते·······॥

Both amba and ambe occur (in the vocative) in the Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā.[124] Pāṇini ignores this even as many other Vedic peculiarities. According to Kāśikā, the shortening of the final vowel is optional in Chandas even in the case of ambāḍā, etc. Patañjali gives another word also which shortens its 'a' optionally on the vocative, namely, devatā. The form devatā is confined to the Vedic language. Kāśikā says छन्दस्येव ह्रस्वत्वमिष्यते. The Mahābhāṣya on this Sūtra accounts also for an interesting compound in which the word mātṛ is substituted by mātac ('c' being only an anubandha) in the vocative, when reverence to one's mother is desired to be conveyed.

मातृणां मातच्पुत्रार्थमर्हते । मातृणां मातजादेशो वक्तव्यः पुत्रार्थमर्हते । गार्गीमात वात्सीमात ॥

7.4.3. Among those ṇijanta roots which optionally shorten their penultimate vowel in the reduplicated aorist, the following are also included by Patañjali.

काण्यादीनां चेति वक्तव्यम् । के पुनः काण्यादयः । काणिराणिश्राणिभाणि-हेटिलोपयः । अचकाणत् अचीकणत् । अरराणत् अरीरणत् ॥

7.4.35. This rule states that in Chandas the final vowel of the stems ending in 'a' is neither lengthened nor substituted by 'ī' before the affix kyac except in the case of putra, e.g., mitrayuḥ (but putrīyantaḥ R.V.VII. 96.4). Patañjali adds 'ādi' to putra to except some more words. Says he :

अत्यल्पमिदमुच्यते ऽपुत्रस्येति । अपुत्रादीनामिति वक्तव्यम् । इहापि यथा स्यात्-जानीयन्तोन्यग्रवः पुत्रीयन्तः सुदानवः ॥

124. V. S. 23.18 and6.36.

7.4.49. In Pāṇini's language the alternative forms of certain words are used synonymously; but in Patañjali's each (alternative form) acquires a definite significance. This semantic specialization seems to have begun already in the days of Kātyāyana who says : श्यतेरित्वं व्रते नित्यम्. These words are enumerated by Patañjali in the following Kārikā.

देवत्रातो[125](a) गलो(b) ग्राह(c) इति(d) योगे च सद्विधिः ।
मिथस्ते न विभाष्यन्ते गवाक्षः(e) संशितव्रतः ॥

7.4.48. In the Vārtika अपोभिमासश्छन्दसि on this Sūtra Kātyāyana points out that the 's' of māsa is changed to 't' before the case affix 'bhis.' Patañjali gives some more Vedic examples which are not covered by the Vārtika.

Patañjali :

अत्यल्पमिदमुच्यते । स्ववस्स्वतवसोर्मास उषसश्च त इष्यते। स्ववद्भिः स्वतवद्भिः । समुषद्भिरजायथाः ॥

8.2.25. The Śloka Vārtika धिसकारे सिचो लोपः etc., on this Sūtrā advocates the form cakāddhi in the second person singular of the imperative of 'kās'; but Patañjali differing from his predecessors prefers to have cakādhi. Says he :

इष्टमेवैतत्संगृहीतम् । चकाधीरित्येव भवितव्यम् ।

The difference exists in this : According to some grammarians (whose view is represented by the Śloka Vārtika) the elision of 's' taught by P. 8.2.25 is confined to that which pertains to 'sic'; and as this (the 's' in the example quoted above) is not a part of that affix (sic) it is not elided, but changed to 'd', thus giving the form cakāddhi.

8. 2. 55. Patañjali accounts for two words, namely, saṃphulla and parikṛśa which are not analysed by Pāṇini or Kātyāyana.

8. 2. 80. The following Kārikā in the Mahābhāṣya gives a three-fold interpretation of this Sūtra, and accordingly we have three

125. Vide the Siddhānta-Kaumudī on (a) P. 8.2.26, (b) 8.2.21, (c) 3.1.143, (d) 3.2.126, (e) 6.1.123.

forms of adadryac (añc compounded with the pronoun adas). The meaning of the Sūtra is this : In the word adadryac 'd' is replaced by 'm' and the vowel following it (d) by 'u' or 'ū' (as the case may be) when it does not end in 's'. According to some, 'mu' like 'l' in calīkḷpyate must he had separately in both adas and adri; according to others, 'mu' is substituted only for that portion which stands in proximity to the final; there are yet others who think that 'a' (aseḥ) in this Sūtra must be understood as that enjoined by P. 7. 2. 102. (i. e. Tyadādyatva) and according to them, this rule does not apply outside the range of that Sūtra (7. 2. 102).. We have thus three forms amumuyaṅ and adadryaṅ. Which of these Pāṇini and Kātyāyana have in their respective language cannot be ascertained.

अदसोद्रेः पृथङ् मुत्वं केचिदिच्छन्ति लत्ववत् ।
केचिदन्त्यसदेशस्य नेत्येकेऽसेर्हि दृश्यते ॥

8. 2. 83. Pāṇini says that the last vowel of a sentence employed in response to a salutation, is both Pluta and Udātta except when referring to a Śūtra.

Patañjali adds : अत्यल्पमिदमुच्यतेऽशूद्र इति । अशूद्रस्त्र्यसूयकेष्विति वक्तव्यम् ।

The status of women which was so high in the Vedic and the Upaniṣadic times, seems to have begun to degenerate[126] in Patañjalis days (a fact corrobortted by other contemporary sources also) when they were not shown this honour in response to salutation. From the following Vārtika it may also be inferred that a similar degenration takes place in the status of Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas in post-Pāṇinian days. Kātyāyana says that Pluta is optional in their case : भोराजन्यविशां वा ।

8. 2. 92. Patañjali subscribes to the view of some other

126. Cf, अविद्वांसः प्रत्यभिवादे नाम्नो ये न प्लुतिं विदुः ।
कामं तेषु तु विप्रोष्य स्त्रीष्विवायमहं वदेत् ॥
(Mahābhāṣaya, Vol. I, p. 3)

grammarian according to whom Pluta is optional in all instances. Says he ;

अपर आह । सर्वः प्लुतः साहसमनिच्छता विभाषा वक्तव्यः ।

8. 4. 6. With regard to the application of this Sūtra which allows option in the substitution of 'ṇ' for the 'n' of vana when this happens to be a member of a compound denoting a herb or a forest tree, Patañjali introduces the following restrictions.

द्व्यक्षरत्र्यक्षरेभ्य इति वक्तव्यम् । इह माभूत्-देवदारुवनम् । इरिकादिभ्यः प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । इरिकावनम् । तिमिरवनम् ।

8. 4. 61. The Mahābhāṣya on this gives a new word, namely, utkandaka meaning some disease.

Only some of the most important linguistic changes have been pointed out here. These are illustrative and not exhaustive.

CHAPTER V

Patañjali and the Uṇādi Sūtras

Incidentally we may discuss here Pāṇini 3. 3. 1, उणादयो बहुलम्, as this Sūtra has very important bearing on the linguistic changes. The authorship of the Uṇādi Sūtras is still debated. "We have no direct tradition as to the author of the Sūtras" says Aufrecht. The controversy regarding the authorship of this work seems to have persisted even in the days of the various Pāṇinian commentators.

[127]Some assign them to Śākaṭāyana, an ancient grammarian who held that all nouns are derived from verbal roots; and others to Vararuci; and yet there are others among modern scholars who would rush to indentify this Vararuci with Kātyāyana and father the whole work upon this author of the Vārtikas.

Their chronological relation to Pāṇini is also a matter upon which there is cleavage of opinion. I believe with Goldstucker[128] that though the suffixes taught in these Sūtras are of greater antiquity, the work in the present form is really a production of a later period. But Goldstucker's view should be clarified and slightly modified. Though the majority of the Uṇādi suffixes are undoubtedly pre-Pāṇinian, all of them cannot be so. A correct interpretation of P. 3. 3. 1. and the Śloka Vārtika thereon gives us a glimpse into the true history of this work.

P. 3.3.1. उणादयो बहुलम् ।

Let us interpret this Sūtra as it is. There is no necessity to overstep the limits of its literal import. This is read by Pāṇini among those aphorisms which teach the Kṛt affixes. The word ādayaḥ like that in bhūvādayaḥ 1. 3. 1, is used here to point out to

---

127. See Vasu's Translation of the S. Khumudī, Vol. 2, part II, pp. 145-146.
128. See Pāṇini, pp. 170-171.

a list enumerating these terminations. Whether Pāṇini availed himself of the list drawn up by Śākaṭāyana or he himself compiled one is a question which we cannot satisfactorily answer at present. What is likely is that Pāṇini had before him a list (probably compiled by himself) of suffixes or words formed by them, selected from Śākaṭāyana's work or from the works of those who belonged to Śākaṭāyana's school. We must know that Śākaṭāyana as an etymologist derived every word from a root with an affix. In doing so, he could not necessarily confine all his affixes to the forces of the Present and the Past, as he too, must have had in his language words used with the force of the Future. But Pāṇini in his Sūtras 3. 3. 1 and 2 refers only to those Uṇādi affixes which are used in Vartamāna and Bhūta. In 3. 4. 75 Pāṇini says that the Uṇādi affixes denote ideas other than those of the dative and the ablative. Nothing would be more foolish than to believe that Pāṇini restricted all the affixes invented by the etymologists to these senses. It would be tantamount to saying that the words known to Śākaṭāyana and his followers were used only in these senses specified by Pāṇini. Nāgeśa seems to have dived deeper than many other later commentators into the meaning of these Sūtras when he intelligently remarks :

[129]कृवा इत्यादिसूत्राणि..................शाकटायनादिप्रणीतव्याकरणान्तरादभियुक्तै: संगृहीतानि ।

By using the word saṅgraha he shows that only those which are necessary have been adopted in this work. So by uṇādayaḥ Pāṇini meant only some of these affixes invented by Śākaṭāyana. Perhaps Uṇādi might have formed one chapter of Kṛt affixes in Śākaṭāyana's work. The word 'bahulam' is always used by Pāṇini to mean 'often' or 'mostly.' When the instances are numerous he says 'bahulam' and when they are only a few he has 'dṛśyante', as in the next Sūtra (3.3.2). Bahulam is an adverb and here modifies use of these affixes with the force of the Present. The meaning of the Sūtra then is this : The Uṇādi affixes are used mostly with force of the Present भूतेऽपि दृश्यन्ते:, (i.e.) they are also seen employed with the force of the Past.

---

129. L. S. S., Vol. II, p. 807.

This reference to them in his work is only to acknowledge that the words formed by these affixes are admissible only in the meanings specified by him. It scarcely means that he is in favour of the method adopted by Śākaṭāyana and his followers in deriving these words. Nāgeśa rightly observes[130] :

अनेन भाष्यवार्तिकसमूहेन उणादयो बहुलमिति व्याकरणान्तरव्यवस्थापकमिति स्पष्टमेवोक्तम् ।

It will thus be seen that Pāṇini wants only to restrict the use of those words. The restriction is his own; otherwise his characteristic honesty and his reference to his predecessors would have, as in many other places, made him here also say : Uṇādayaḥ Śākaṭāyano bahulam.

The Śloka Vārtika on this Sūtra, however, reveals the imposition of a new and liberal interpretation on the word bahulam, which leaves the doors wide open for the etymologists to bustle in. On the Sūtra under discussion Patañjali quotes this Śloka Vārtika and explains it as follows :

Patañjali : बहुलवचनं किमर्थम् ?

Why the word bahulam has been employed in the Sūtra. Śloka Vārtika :

बाहुलकं प्रकृतेस्तनुदृष्टेः ।

Patañjali : तन्वीभ्यः प्रकृतिभ्य उणादयो दृश्यन्ते ।

Uṇādi affixes come only after a limited number of roots and not after all. It is to cover all the roots that the word bahulam has been employed.

Śloka Vārtika : प्रायसमुच्चयनादपि तेषाम् ।

Patañjali : प्रायेण खल्वपि ते समुच्चिताः न सर्वे समुच्चिताः ॥

Moreover, only a few affixes have been covered.

130. Ibid. Vol. 2, p. 808.

Here 'teṣām' which is in the masculine gender, refers only to Pratyayas and not to Prakṛtis. Vasu forcibly refers it to Prakṛtis, when he says : "[131]Moreover there has been no exhaustive enumeration of the several roots after which these affixes come : only some of them have been collected in works treating of Uṇādi affixes."

The first sentence discloses the inexhaustiveness in the enumeration of roots and the second shows it in that of affixes. Viṭṭhala in his Prakriyāprasāda clearly points this out as follows :

[132]अल्पाः प्रकृतय उक्ताः । अल्पे च प्रत्ययाः ।

Śloka Vārtika : कार्यसशेषविधेश्च तदुक्तम् ।

Patañjali : कार्याणि खल्वपि सशेषाणि कृतानि । न सर्वाणि लक्षणेन परिसमाप्तानि । किं पुनः कारणं तन्वीभ्यः प्रकृतिभ्य उणादयो दृश्यन्ते न सर्वाभ्यो दृश्यन्ते । किं च कारणं कार्याणि सशेषाणि कृतानि न सर्वाणि लक्षणेन परिसमाप्तानि ।।

The various operations of the affixes including those of their Anubandhas have also not been exhaustively treated ; there yet remains much to be said about these. What is the reason for this incompleteness of treatment ? Why do the Uṇādi affixes come only after a limited number of roots and why have their operations not been exhaustively treated ? This is to show that there are more affixes to be included in the Uṇādi list.

Śloka Vārtika : नैगमरूढिभवं हि सुसाधु ।

Patañjali : नैगमाश्च रूढिभवाश्चौणादिकाः कथं सुसाधवः स्युः ?

How are Vedic words and words having conventional meanings correct (understandable) (if they are not explained etymologically) ?

The Śloka Vārtika then gives the following answer to all these questions.

---

131. S. Kaumudī, Part II, p. 331.
132. Ibid. Part II, II, p. 599.

Śloka Vārtika : नाम च धातुजमाह निरुक्ते ।

Patañjali : नाम खल्वपि धातुजम् । एवमाहुर्नैरुक्ताः ।

Śloka Vārtika : व्याकरणे शकटस्य च तोकम् ।

Patañjali : वैयाकरणानां च शाकटायन आह धातुजं नामेति ।

In Nirukta it is said that all nouns are derived from simple roots. Among grammarians Śākaṭāyana, too, holds the same view.

So much about Vedic words and words having conventional significances. What about words which do not clearly show their derivations ?

Śloka Vārtika : यत्र विशेषपदार्थसमुत्थं प्रत्ययतः प्रकृतेश्च तदूह्यम् ।

There also the proper bases and affixes which form those words must be inferred. The Śloka Vārtika drives us to this conclusion that we should think that Pāṇini employes bahulam in this Sūtra in order to cover all other words (which he has not enumerated) which may be split up into bases and affixes as suggested by Śākaṭāyana and that all the Vedic words, words having conventional significances and words without apparent derivations have thus all been covered by him by this Sūtra : they can be explained etymologically

The difference between this interpretation given by the Śloka Vārtika and the one given above is now quite clear. Pāṇini, in fact, never employed the word bahulam as a panacea for all these supposed ills. That he has used it as an adverb modifying Vartamāna may be known by comparing this Sūtra with the next one in which he says that they are seen also used with the force of the Past. In the light of this it is not correct to render Uṇādayo bahulam into "They[133] are too many".

The change of meaning which the word bahulam undergoes after Pāṇini's time accounts for the history of the Uṇādi Sūtras better than anything else. Pāṇini, a very independent and reasonable grammarian, was influenced least by the Nairuktas and Śākaṭāyana. But this Śloka Vārtika indicates that some of his successors who, as described above, expanded the scope of this Sūtra to include a great

133. Vasu, Vol. 2, Part II, p. 145.

number of words (which are primitive or non-derivative from the Pāṇinian point of view) in the Uṇādi list, were not so. The fact that the works of the etymologists, like the various Prātiśākhyas, have influenced some of Pāṇini's successors deserves attention. Kātyāyana who, as will be presently seen, often favours the etymologists, is one among those successors and belongs to a period not far distant from that in which flourished the author of the Śloka Vārtika. Much of the material in the present Uṇādi Sūtras relates to this period, though the form in which it now appears is generally late. All this is clearly borne out by the following evidence. Let us begin from Pāṇini.

Some of these Uṇādi Sūtras are not known to Pāṇini.

In 3.4.74 Pāṇini passes on certain words like bhīma, etc., as Nipātanas, i.e., words which admit of no analysis into Prakṛti and **Pratyaya**, denoting ablation. In the previous Sūtra he has given **two** similar words as Nipātanas denoting the idea of the dative, viz., **dāśa** and goghna. In the very next Sūtra (ताभ्यामन्यत्रोणादयः) he says **that** the words formed by the Uṇādi affixes denote other ideas than these two, i. e., dative and ablation. From this it is clear that he does not regard words belonging to the Bhīmādi group as words formed by the Uṇādi affixes. But we have the following Rules in the Uṇādi Sūtra treating of these words :

1.7, 1.148, 2.61, 2.62, 3.82, 3.112, 4.45, 4.217 and 5.22.

Pāṇini 2.4.57 (vāyau) substitutes optionally the root 'aj' by 'vi'. The woıd vāyu is thus accounted for by this Sūtra as derived from the root 'aj'. The first Uṇādi Sūtra कृपावाजिमिस्वदिसाध्यशूभ्य उण् derives this word from the root vā (vāti). If Pāṇini had this Sūtra before him, he as an Avyutpannavādin, would have never derived this word from a root as described above. It may be agreed that Pāṇini in 2.4.57 wants only to enjoin an option in the substitution of 'aj' by 'vi' and that as there are also instances of the latter other than this (vāyu), this cannot be an incontestible proof; but we have the following indubitable evidence of the Mahābhāṣya which instances this very word under the above Sūtra. What is more interesting, even Patañjali does not know the first rule of the present Uṇādi work.

Patañjali :

> न तर्हीदानीमिदं "वायौ" (2.4.57) इति वक्तव्यम् ? वक्तव्यं च ।
> किं प्रयोजनम् ? नेयं विभाषा । किं तर्हि ? आदेशोऽयं विधीयते ।
> वा इत्ययमादेशो भवत्यजेर्यौ परतः । वायुरिति ।

Nāgeśa[134] with his characteristic insight has not failed to note this.

Reviewing in the Indian Culture, Vol. IV, p. 375, the Uṇādi Sūtras with the Prakriyāsarvasva of Nārāyaṇa published as No. 7 in the Madras University Sanskrit series, Dr. Batakrishna Ghosh says with reference to Dr. Kunhan Raja's introductory remark– "this commentary on the Sūtras of Pāṇini forms a basis not only for understanding the meaning of the Sūtras but also reconstructing the history of the various systems of Sanskrit grammar" on the work as follows :–"It is also implied in this quotation that Pāṇini himself was the author of the Uṇādi Sūtras. Such an assumption in spite of Goldstucker, is surely unwarranted. We are confronted with two contradictory but undeniable facts in this regard. Pāṇini knew at least some of the Uṇādi Sūtras. Cf. Pāṇini VI. 4.97 (इस्मन्त्रन्क्विषुच) in which the first three suffixes are Uṇādis. A number of Uṇādi suffixes are again mentioned in 6.3.53 (7.2.9 ?)"

It may be pointed out that though Pāṇini knows some Uṇādi suffixes there is nothing of an evidence showing that he knows the present Uṇādi Sūtras.

Some are not known to Kātyāyana

On P.3.2.178 Kātyāyana has the Vārtika "वचिप्रच्छ्यायतस्तुकटप्रुजुश्रीणां दीर्घश्च ।

These roots take 'kvip' and their vowel is lengthened when followed by the suffix, e.g., vāk, śabdaprāṭ, āyatastūh, kaṭaprūḥ, jūḥ and śrīḥ. After instancing these words, Patañjali refers to an emendation in regard to 'vaci' and pracchi by another commentator and rejects it as follows :—

---

134. See L.S.S., Vol. 2, p. 810.

अपर आह—व्रचिप्रच्छ्योरसंप्रसारणं चेति वक्तव्यम् । तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् । न वक्तव्यम् । दीर्घवचनसामर्थ्यात्संप्रसारणं न भविष्यति । इदमिह संप्रधार्यम् । दीर्घत्वं क्रियतां संप्रसारणमिति । किमत्र कर्तव्यम् ? परत्वात्संप्रसारणम् । अन्तरङ्गं दीर्घत्वम् । कान्तरङ्गता ? प्रत्ययोत्पत्तिसंनियोगेन दीर्घत्वमुच्यते । उत्पन्ने प्रत्यये संप्रसारणम् । तत्रान्तरङ्गत्वात् दीर्घत्वे कृते संप्रसारणं प्रसारणपरपूर्वत्वे कृते कार्यकृतत्वाभावात् पुनर्दीर्घत्वं न स्यात् । तस्मात्सुष्ठूच्यते दीर्घवचनसामर्थ्यात् प्रसारणं न भविष्यतीति ॥

Neither Kātyāyana nor Patañjali knows that there is an Uṇādi root to account for these words. When there is an explanation in the Uṇādi, Kātyāyana does not supplement Pāṇini. For instance, रजकरजनरजस्सु कित्वात् सिद्धम् । (P.3.4.24, V.5)

Patañjali :

कित एवैते औणादिकाः । तद्यथा--रुचकः, भुवनम्, शिर इति ॥

The author of the Uṇādi Sūtras has, on the other hand, taken these two Vārtikas together to form his rule:

क्वब्वचिप्रच्छिश्रिस्रुद्रुप्रुज्वां दीर्घोऽसंप्रसारणं च । (2.57)

The plagiarism is clear. The identification of Kātyāyana with Vararuci referred to by Vimalasarasvatī[135] in his Rūpamālā is as unreasonable as that with the author of the Prākṛtavyākaraṇa. It is deserving of notice that Kātyāyana, though he generally favours the Avyutpattipakṣa, has not even cared to comment upon P.3.3.1.

Inspite of Kātyāyana's various shortcomings, Pāṇini has to thank him for one great service which consists in having not tortured Pāṇini's meaning. To him the word 'bahulam' means what is exactly means to Pāṇini.

Some are not known to Patañjali

It has been noticed above that Patañjali introduces a new affix namely 'krukan' (P·3.2.174) to account for the word bhīruka. This word is explained by Uṇādi 2.31 by the same affix, and Patañjali, a staunch adherent of the Avyutpattipakṣa would have

135. See Vasu, Trans. of the Siddhānta Kaumudī, Vol. 2, Part II, p. 146.

never supplemented P. 3.2.174 if he had this Uṇādi rule before him. In a supplementary Vārtika (Iṣṭi) on P. 6.4.40 (ऊङ् च गमादीनामिति वक्तव्यम्) Patañjali derives the word bhrū with the affix ūṅ, eliding the nasal. The same word is derived in quite a different way by Uṇādi 2.68 (भ्रमेश्च डूः) which is a clever improvement upon the Mahābhāṣya. Nāgeśa[136] refers to another instance of this kind. In order to account for certain words in which 'r' has chaged to 'l' Patañjali says that the following may be added to P. 8.2.18 (कृपो रो लः)

वालमूललघ्वलमङ्गुलीनां वा लो रमापद्यत इति वक्तव्यम् । अश्ववारः ।
अश्ववालः ………………। संज्ञाछन्दसोर्वा कपिलकादीनामिति वक्तव्यम् ।
कपिरकः । कपिलकः …………॥

Nāgeśa points out that all these are words explained by the Uṇādi[137] Sūtras.

In some cases the author of the Uṇādi Sūtras copies exactly the Sūtras of the Aṣṭādhyāyī.

Cf. P. 6.1.21	चायः की	Uṇādi. 1.73
P. 3.2.75	अन्येभ्योऽपि दृश्यन्ते	Uṇādi 4.105 etc. etc.

Many more instances can be adduced, but these will suffice to show that the author of the present Uṇādi Sūtra has freely drawn upon the Aṣṭādhyāyī, the Vārtikas and the Mahābhāṣya

Internal divergence

This brief survey of the history of the Uṇādi Sūtras would be incomplete if we do not notice here the differences among our grammarians in regard to the Vyutpattipakṣa. Kātyāyana[138] in all his allusions to the Uṇādi definitely exhibits a leaning towards Śākaṭāyana's school; but Patañjali in all those cases adheres staunchly to Pāṇini's Avyutpattipakṣa and refutes all those Vārtikas saying : उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि ।

---

136. See L.S.S., Vol. 2, p. 808.
137. Vide Uṇādi 4.2. etc.
138. See P. 1.1.61, V. 4; 3.4.77, 3; 4.1.1, 2; 6.1.162, 5; 7.1.2 3.

Kātyāyana[139] himself points out that Pāṇini is not in favour of the Uṇādi; and we can infer that most of these affixes are pre-Pāṇinian and that Kātyāyana does not allude to the present work when he speaks of Uṇādis. On such occasions as noted above, Kātyāyana says that Pāṇini's rules do not hold good for the Uṇādis. The Vārtikakāra, as has already been noted, is a great Vedic scholar. Steeped that he is in the exegetical lore of his time, he cannot but leave some traces of it in his work. He makes his allegiance to Śākaṭāyana crystal clear when he says : प्रातिपदिकविज्ञानाच्च पाणिनेः सिद्धम् । (7.1.2, V. 5) i.e., the words referred to under this Sūtra are not Vyutpannas (do not admit of an etymological analysis) according to Pāṇini. This shows that he is not in agreement with the Sūtrakāra. We have something more to say about this great grammarian Kātyāyana. He never mixes up theories or their exponents; never tampers with the Sūtras nor tortures their meaning; there is no cribbing, cabining and caging in his work. Whenever a point of difference arises between himself and Pāṇini he clarifies his position as well as that of Pāṇini, avoiding injustice and placing everything beyond doubt. His Vārtikas thus sometimes illumine the Indian linguistic antiquity which is at times the despair of grammatical historians. Instances like the above prove conclusively that he cannot be the author of the Śloka Vārtika; yet scholars have not been wanting to suggest that Kātyāyana is himself the author of the Uṇādi Sūtras. It is a sorry sight that is afforded by theories appearing in an uninterrupted procession, quite in the teeth of the internal evidence furnished against them by the texts. Goldstucker's and Kielhorn's appeals have fallen on deaf ears. A proper study of the Vārtikas would certainly enlighten us on many such problems as the one under discussion, which would otherwise remain knotty for ever. This much we have to say of Kātyāyana in this connection.

When we come to the Śloka Vārtika we see that the rule उणादयो बहुलम् is wrested from its context and interpreted in a quite different way in order to obtain Pāṇini's sanction. The Śloka-Vārtikakāra acted the role of a liaison officer and made room for convergence. What was the result ? When the Uṇādis with all

139. See 7.2.8.1; 7.4.13, 1; 8.2.78, 2; 8.3 59, 1. Vide the Mahābhāṣya on these for full discussions.

their ramifications appeared later in the form of the present work, they slowly came nearer and nearer until they came to be regarded as an important appendage to the Aṣṭādhyāyī. There is also another factor which is not less responsible for this convergence. The author of the Uṇādi Sūtras uses Pāṇinian terms and Anubandhas which make his work depend on Pāṇini for its interpretation. What is true of the Uṇādi Sūtras is also true of the other appendages like the Phiṭ Sūtra, the Liṅgānuśāsana, etc. Kāśikā has not commented upon these. A comparison of the following Mahābhāṣya which enumerated the Upadeśas with the Kārikā of the later commentators given after that, will indicate the truth. At the end of Paspaśā Patañjali says :

> क्वेमे संवृतादयः श्रूयेरन्निति । आगमाः शुद्धाः पठ्यन्ते । विकारेषु तर्हि । विकाराः शुद्धाः पठ्यन्ते । प्रत्ययेषु तर्हि । प्रत्ययाः शुद्धाः पठ्यन्ते । धातुषु तर्हि । धातवोऽपि शुद्धाः पठ्यन्ते । प्रातिपदिकेषु तर्हि । प्रातिपदिकान्यपि शुद्धानि पठ्यन्ते । यानि तर्ह्यग्रहणानि प्रातिपदिकानि एतेषामपि स्वरवर्णानुपूर्वीज्ञानार्थं उपदेशः कर्तव्यः ॥

The Kārikā of later commentators runs :

> धातुसूत्रगणोणादिवाक्यलिङ्गानुशासनम् ।
> आगमप्रत्ययादेशा उपदेशाः प्रकीर्तिताः ॥

This includes the Uṇādi and the Liṅgānuśāsana also among the Upadeśas.

Patañjali's position

Kātyāyana's position with regard to the Uṇādi Sūtras has been made clear; but something more has to be said about Patañjali with whom we are primarily concerned here. When the Ślokavārtikakāra justified the intrusion of the etymologists, Patañjali refused to give them a long tether. He instructed them to confine their busy efforts to Saṃjñās and thus placed with them orders for ropes of sand. According to Patañjali, the etymologists would have prospered greatly among words like Ḍittha, etc. which do not have any intelligible etymologies and which may be coined by any one at any time. We can now understand why Patañjali, though

in all other instances he says उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि, derives लृपिङ्ग,[140] etc with the Uṇādi affixes.

Says he :

संज्ञासु[141] धातुरूपाणि प्रत्ययाश्च ततः परे ।
कार्याद्विद्यादनूबन्धमेतच्छास्त्रमुणादिषु ॥

Viṭṭhala also in his Prakriyāprasāda says :

डित्यादिः[142] तत्र तादेः प्रत्ययात् डीत्यादिघातोरूह्यम् ।

As[143] against this it may be noted that Kātyāyana regards even such words as Śaṅkha, kaṇṭha, etc. as Uṇādis.

The Author of the Uṇādi Sūtras

Who is then the author of the Uṇādi Sūtras ? Most probably a grammarian called Vararuci who flourished after Patañjali compiled these Uṇādi Sūtras drawing fully well upon the Munitraya text, as well as upon those of the etymologists to which he might have had access. In an article in the journal of Oriental[144] Research, Madras, K. G. Subrahmanyam identifies him with Kātyāyana, the author of our Vārtikas, without adducing any tangible evidence. In the present state of our knowledge we have to say that this is most improbable. I have also to disagree with Dr. Chintamani who in his introduction to the[145] Uṇādi Sūtras of Bhoja and of the Kātantra school observes as follows :

"The Uṇādi Sūtras (belonging to the Kṛt section) of the Kātantra school were therefore not composed by Sarvavarman but Kātyāyana alone."

Admitting that the author of the Uṇādi Sūtras is called Kātyāyana, it may be pointed out that there is nothing to warrant

---

140. See Patañjali on ऋलृक्
141. 3.3.1.
142. Part II p. 600.
143. See 7.1.2, 7.3.50, etc.
144. 1928, p. 31 Sans. Series 7, p. XIV.
145. Madras University.

his identification with the author of the Vārtikas. Sanskrit literary tradition knows several Kātyāyanas having the surname Vararuci. The two names are seen mostly going together. Probably the true bearers of both the names are only some old Kātyāyanas; but with later commentators almost every Vararuci comes to be called also Kātyāyana. This adds perplexity to confusion, and Vararuci thus becomes an almost mysterious name in Sanskrit literature. The works coming under this name are such as have to be assigned to widely varying dates. We cannot but be cautious in all such cases. Śvetavanavāsin does not attribute this to any single author when he says : शाकटायनादिभिः कृतम्. That the present work is based on Śākaṭāyana's grammar nobody doubts; but what we cannot accept is his authorship of this. In these circumstances Goldstucker's view stands uncontroverted.

It may be noticed in passing that the Uṇādi Sūtras themselves have undergone some changes. Bhaṭṭoji[146] Dikṣita in his commentary on them often disagrees with Ujjvaladatta. There is also the controversy regarding the real extent of the work; according to some it consists of only five Pādas, i. e., Pañcapādī, and according to others, of ten Pādas, i. e., Daśapādī. What is interesting above all is that "every[147] system of Sanskrit grammar has its Uṇādi Sūtras.

How and to what extent the Pāṇinian school was influenced by the Nairuktas and the grammarians who followed them, particularly at a later stage, is a subject of absorbing interest. It has not so far received from scholars the attention it deserves. I intend dealing with this subject separately elsewhere.

It may be pointed out in passing here (What I have dealt with in detail[148] elsewhere) that Śeṣanāga, the author of the Paramārthasāra[149] (also called the Ādhārakārikās or Āryāpañcāśīti), a work of the Seśvara Vaiṣṇava and Idealistic type of Sāṃkhya philosophy, cannot

---

146. See Prauḍha manormā, Part II, pp. 747-810; see also Burnell, Catalogue of Sans. Mass. p. 42.
147. See Dr. Chintamni's Introdution to the Uṇādi Sūtras, M. U. S. S. 11, IX.
148. Indian culture, Patañjali and his relation to some Authors and Works.
149. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. 12; Pandit, Vol.V; Pattisapu Venkesvarudu, in Telgu script, 1907; S. S. S. Sastri, with

be identified with Patañjali author of the Mahābhāṣya. The Idealistic Sāṃkhya expounded here is divided from the later Advaita only by a faint line. Similarities between the Paramārthasāra and the Gauḍapādakārikā in regard to thought and language suggest that the latter owes much to the former. The philosophic views expounded in the Paramārthasāra are quite different from those held by the Mahābhāṣyakāra. A close study of the Mahābhāṣya shows that Patañjali was a Realist. In Paspaśā he gives us his view of matter. To him matter is either Kūṭasthanitya or Pravāhanitya. He seems to me more inclined towards Pravāhanityatā. He speaks of the perpetual changes of the Bhāvas :

सर्वश्च पुनर्मूर्तय एवमात्मिकाः । न हीह कश्चित्स्वस्मिन्नात्मनि मुहूर्तमप्यवतिष्ठते । वर्धते वा यावदनेन वर्धितव्यमपायेन वा युज्यते । तच्चोभयं सर्वत्र ।
(Cf. Nirukta also.)

Patañjali uses the word 'Ātman' to mean Dravya. He docs not, as does the Paramārthasāra, use it in the metaphysical sense (cf. एकोयमात्मोदकं नाम), He also speaks of two Ātmans अन्तरात्मन् and शरीरात्मन्. He is not an Absolutist and to him the world is not illusory. It should also be noted that the Paramārthasāra appears to have borrowed its ideas from an ancient Sāṃkhya work called Ṣaṣṭitantra. Keith,[150] disagreeing with Garbe, suggests that Ṣaṣṭitantra was not a special work but 'a term for the Sāṁkhya philosophy as a system of sixty principles'. This view cannot be accepted. In Bhartṛahari's own commentary on the Bṛahmakāṇḍa the following verse is quoted from the Ṣaṣṭitantra :

इदं फेनो न कश्चिद्वा बुद्बुदो वा न कश्चन ।
मायैषा बत दुष्पारा विपश्चिदिति पश्यति ॥

Vṛṣabhadeva points out that this quotation is from the work called Ṣaṣṭitantra. 'Nāga' both in the names Śeṣanāga' and

---

translation, Karnataka Publishing House. The Paramārthasāra of Abhinava is a Śaiva adaptation of Śeṣanāga's work Dr. Barnett's view (see g. R. A. S. 1910) that the former, i. e., the Śaiva work is the original of the latter is not correct. The adaptation has been published with an English Translation by Dr. Barnett.

150. Sāṁkhya System, p. 69.

'Piṅgalanāga' (author of the Chandaḥsūtra) has led to the wrong indentification of Patañjali with both of them. It may be remembered that according to a legend, the author of the Mahābhāṣya is an incarnation of Ādiśeṣa. It should also be noted that many verses from the Paramārthasāra are quoted by Nāgeśa in the Laghusiddhāntamañjūṣā. He ascribes them to Śeṣanāga and not to Patañjali.

Bhartṛhari in his Bṛahmakāṇḍa of the Vākyapadīya, however, propounds Śabādvaita (Śabdavivartavāda), a pre-Śaṅkara phase of Advaita. Unfortunately, the contribution made by Bhartṛhari to the development of the Advaitic thought, has not so far received adequate notice of our historians of Indian philosophy. Maṇḍana dealt with both Śabdādvaita and Brahmādvaita. I am not yet convinced of his identity with Sureśvara.

Similarly the identification of the Mahābhāṣyakāra with the author of the Yogasūtra[151] and Caraka is also not supported by any evidence.

I have also pointed out elsewhere[152] that some portions of the Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa were not known to Patañjali (at least in their present form) and also that Śabara knew the *M*ahābhāṣya.

The early history of the Sphoṭa Doctrine from Sphoṭāyana to Kātyāyana and the work named Saṅgraha have been dealt with by me elsewhere (Rangaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume). The unfortunate loss of Saṅgraha and also of Bhartṛhari's *Ś*abdadhātu-samīkṣā to us has left a gap in our information regarding the various views held by the early grammarians and others on Śabda (except what we have about them in Vākyapadīya etc. Cf. 1-107 वायोरणूनां ज्ञानस्य; 2-347;वाक्यस्य बुद्धौ नित्यत्वं etc. in Vākyapadīya). Many ancient grammarians held the view that Śabda is Nitya, immutable) Some were Idealists like वार्ताक्ष and औदुम्बरायण. Jaimini, the Mīmāṃsaka,

151. योगेन चित्तस्य पदेन वाचो मलं शरीरस्य च वेद्यकेन ।
योऽपाकरोत्तं प्रवरं मुनीनां पतञ्जलिं प्राञ्जलिरानतोऽस्मि ॥
The philosophic views of Caraka (which follows an ancient Sāṃkhya system) and of the Yogasūta are different from those of the Mahābhāṣyakāra.

152. In the article in the Indian culture.

considered the relation of Śabda and Artha as eternal (औत्पत्तिकस्तु शब्दस्यार्थेन संबन्धः) which reminds us of the Vārtika सिद्धे शब्दार्थसंबन्धे at the beginning of the Mahābhāṣya. Saṅkara also deals with the subject under Brahmasūtra 1.3.28. In the Nirukta we have: इन्द्रियनित्यं वचनमौदुम्बरायणः । The Sphoṭa theory is a very ancient one. Pāṇini refers to Sphoṭāyana. Patañjali differentiates between Sphoṭa and Dhvani (Vide my article Vāk before Bhartṛhari, Poona Orientalist, Vol. VIII, 1-2, p. 31 ff.). But neither Pāṇini, Kātyāyana nor Patañjali refers to Vivartavāda. As far as our present knowledge goes and at least among the Pāṇinians, it is with Bhartṛhari, for the first time, that Sphoṭavāda turns into Śabdavivartavāda. It should be remembered in this context that Bhartṛhari was preceded by a very active period of Buddhist Idealism and Logic. The Vedic authority and the Vedantic Absolutism had been challanged. That is how we see him in the Brahmakāṇḍa mainly occupied with the establishment of the Vedic authority and the refutation of the supremacy of Logic. His Śabdavivartavāda is a revival of the Vedantic Idealism in that form. He also revives the Philosophy of Intuition of the Upaniṣads.

The Śabdavivartavāda or Sphoṭavāda as propounded by the author of the Vākyapadīya has, in some respects, influenced the Kashmir Śaiva Tantra, notwithstanding the criticism of Sphoṭa Vāda in Somānanda's Śivadṛṣṭi. That Bhartṛhari was a great post-Upaniṣadic Intuitionist is also clear from an invocatory verse of his quoted by Utpala, commentator on Śivadṛṣṭi : स्वानुभूत्येकमानाय नमः शान्ताय तेजसे । Svānubhūti is Intuition (Self-experience). I have also dealt with this topic in an article in the Aryan Path (Vol. XI, No. 2, pp. 538 ff.) Bhartṛhari's refutation of the supremacy of Logic reminds us of the Upaniṣadic saying नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया and of the तर्काप्रतिष्ठानाधिकरण of the Brahmasūtra of Bādarāyaṇa. When we come to the Laghusiddhāntamañjūṣā of Nāgeśa, we find that the Tantra has in its turn influenced the Sphoṭavāda (Cf. बौद्धार्थस्य वाच्यत्व-निरूपण in the work). This subject is of immense interest and importance to students of Indian Philosophy. It has been touched upon by me here only briefly, as it is outside the main scope of this work. I intend dealing with this in detail elsewhere.

CHAPTER VI

Sanskrit a spoken language in Patañjali's time

The changes which the language undergoes during the interval between Kātyāyana and Patañjali are less than those that take place during that between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, and the latter interval must have undoubtedly been the longer. But even those changes some of which have been pointed out above (excepting those relating to the Vedic language) are quite sufficient to prove that the language is still spoken in Patañjali's time. It is impossible to believe that such tremendous changes can take place within the course of two, three or four centuries in a language confined[153] to written works. Some of them are such as would naturally happen only in a spoken language, (i.e., domestic speech); for instance, dadhisyati and madhusyati (referred to under P. 7.1.51) based on the analogy of payasyati, must have cropped up first in the domestic (where[154] occasions naturally arise for their use) rather than in the literary circles. Besides these changes which arrest our attention, we have some interesting dialogues in the Mahābhāṣya taken by Patañjali from contemporary life. For example, in his commentary on P. 2.4.56 Patañjali gives the following dialogue between a grammarian and a charioteer.

> एवं हि कश्चिद्वैयाकरण आह—कोऽस्य रथस्य प्रवेतेति । सूत आह—आयुष्मन्नहं प्राजितेति । वैयाकरण आह-अपशब्द इति । सूत आह–प्राप्तिज्ञो देवानांप्रियो न त्विष्टिज्ञ इष्यत एतद्रूपमिति । वैयाकरण आह–आहो खल्वनेन दुरुतेन बाध्यामहे इति । सूत आह–न खलु वेञः सूतः सुवतेरेव सूतः……………………॥

There is no doubt that a great influx of corrupt words in Patañjali's time and some Prākṛta dialect (or dialects) must have already come into existence even long before this; but all internal evidence tends to show that this (dialect) which was in all probablity confined to the lower strata of society, was not spoken in the higher

153. It must be noted that the changes which Sanskrit undergoes since it ceases to be a spoken language are very few.
154. Dadhi, madhu and payas are things used side by side in daily life.

circle, i.e., by those who are the repositories of Aryan culture. The very psychology underlying the distinction made between Śabdas and Apaśabdas is a sufficient proof of the non-recognition of this by the literati. Whatever may be the extent to which the Prākṛta dialects predominate in the post-Buddhist India, there is no tangible evidence showing that Sanskrit was not spoken in those times.

Two new types of sentences

Besides all this, we have an indubitable evidence to show that Sanskrit was a spoken language in Pāṇini's time, namely, two new types of sentences which, as we know from Patañjali, develop in the spoken language in the interval between Kātyāyana's time and his and are not known to his predecessors. In the Mahābhāṣya on P. 1.3.1 Patañjali puts the question :

का तर्हीयं वाचोयुक्तिः—भवति पचति, भवति पक्ष्यति, भवत्यपाक्षीदिति ।

and answers :

एषैषा वाचोयुक्तिः । पचादयः क्रियाः भवतिक्रियायाः कर्त्र्यो भवन्तीति । यद्यपि तावदत्रैतच्छक्यते वक्तुं यत्रान्या चान्या च क्रिया, यत्र खलु सैव क्रिया तत्र कथम् । भवेदपि भवेत् । स्यादपि स्यादिति । अत्राप्यन्यत्वमस्ति । कुतः ? कालभेदात्साधनभेदाच्च ॥

The vein in which Patañjali asks the question (का तर्हीयं वाचोयुक्तिः) as well as that in which he answers it (एषैषा तर्हि वाचोयुक्तिः) shows that these are new types of sentences which have just arisen in the spoken language of his time and have not obtained grammatical sanction. The question का तर्हीयं वाचोयुक्तिः : how is it then said – indicates also the spoken nature of these sentences.

Ekavākyatva : Its definitions

Before pointing out that these two types of sentences are not known to Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, let us briefly examine the various stages through which the idea of Ekavākyatva has passed. So far as I am aware, no one has as yet dwelt upon this subject. A brief examination of it from the stand point of the Pāṇinian school would not, therefore, be out of place here.

The earliest known scientific definition of Vākya is that given by Jaimini :

अर्थैकत्वादेकं वाक्यं साकांक्षं चेद्विभागे स्यात् (2-1.46).

i.e., unity in meaning is unity in thought and (according to this Jaimini Sūtra) sentence is the unit of thought expressed, i. e., unit of speech. A d:finition more or less similar to this is given also by the Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra. These definitions may be described as semantic in character, as they are based on the meaning rather than on the forms of words constituting a sentence.

Pāṇini does not define it

Pāṇini does not define Vākya. His reasons for this are quite obvious. In writing his grammar Pāṇini adopts a strictly analytical and morphologistic standpoint and his main concern[155] is with the constituents of the sentence (which he analyses to the last element, viz., the root) rather than with Vākya as a whole. In fact all the earliest grammarians must have concerned themselves only with words (Padas) and their forms and not with Vākya, i.e., syntax. Pāṇini, of course, deals with syntax to some extent, but he does not refer to any ancient authority on this subject in that chapter. This is how Vyākaraṇa has come to be called Pada in contrast to Vākya, which stands for Mīmāṃsā. We can even go a step further and point out that there must have been a definite period in the history of Sanskrit grammar when the line that divided grammar from lexicography was faint and invisible. We have a glimpse of this in the Paspaśāhnika in which Patañjali discusses the method adopted by Pāṇini.

[156]अथैतस्मिञ्शब्दोपदेशे सति किं शब्दानां प्रतिपत्तौ प्रतिपदपाठः कर्तव्यः। गौरश्वः पुरुषो हस्ती शकुनिर्मृगो ब्राह्मण इत्येवमादयः शब्दाः पठितव्याः। नेत्याह·······।

The Padapāṭha in whose constitution grammar had to play not a small part might have also in a measure been responsible for

155. Cf पाणिनीयं महाशास्त्रं पदसाधुत्वलक्षणम् ।
S. L. Mañjūṣā p. 807 (Chowkamba Sans. series).

156. Vol. I, P. 5.

this method. Śākalya was both a Padakāra and a grammarian. It is in the beginning of this lexicographical period that we have to look for the rise of the non-etymologistic schools. The works[157] of these grammarians must have contained long lists of correct words, some Sandhi rules and something of phonetics. There might not have been any analysis like that of Padas into Pratyayas and Prakṛtis. Both in the etymologistic and non-etymologistic schools, grammar had to pass through various stages. But it is not our object to deal with that subject here. Suffice it to point out that Pāṇini (with whom we are concerned here), the greatest of the Indian grammarians, has struck a golden mean between the two extremes of linguistic speculations. He analyses mostly those words into Pratyayas and Prakṛtis which yield a definite law of Utsarga and Apavāda, exceptis expiendis. While certain words yield a reasonable analysis, the same cannot be said of all of them; hence he has Nipātas etc.

The contact with Mīmāṃsā and other philosophical schools gave a new turn to grammatical speculations, and side by side with the analytical, the later grammarians adopted the synthetical method, which in its turn gave rise to the various clear-cut Śābdabodha theories and had its logical consequence in the establishment of the Vākyasphoṭa as the ultimate reality, and of everything else as illusory, i.e., adopted only for theoretical purposes.

[158]वाक्यस्फोटोऽतिनिष्कर्षे तिष्ठतीति मतस्थितिः ।

It has been pointed out above that Pāṇini does not define Vākya. Nevertheless, he refers to it on some occasions and must have a clear definition in his mind. His definition of Padas (सुप्तिङन्तं पदम् 1. 4. 14) may help us in drawing an inference that he has in his mind a morphological definition as that (सुप्तिङन्तचयो-

157. Samasrami refers to some works of this type in his Niruktālocana. Vide A Descriptive catalogue of Sanskrit Mss., Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. II, p. 293.

158. Bhūṣaṇasāra, p. 256;

वाक्यम्) given by Amarasiṃha, a very close student of Pāṇini. The second definition क्रिया वा कारकान्विता

i. e., the semantic definition is given by the lexicographer according to others.

Kātyāyana defines Vākya. Kātyāyana gives the following two definitions.

1. आख्यातं साव्ययकारकविशेषणं वाक्यम् ।

Patañjali explains : आख्यातं साव्ययं सकारकं सकारकविशेषणं वाक्य-संज्ञं भवतीति वक्तव्यम् । साव्ययम्-उच्चैः पठति । नीचैः पठति । सकारकम् । ओदनं पचति । सकारकविशेषणम्-ओदनं मृदुविशदं पचति । सक्रियाविशेषणं चेति वक्तव्यम् । सुष्ठु पचति..................।

The definition does not cover a sentence like Brūhi brūhi which consists of two unqualified identical Ākhyātas: hence Kātyāyana gives another i. e. (2) Ekatiṅ.

एकतिङ् वाक्यसंज्ञं भवतीति वक्तव्यम् । ब्रूहि ब्रूहि ॥

Eka means identical. That is also an Ekavākya which consists of any two identical Tiṅantas. It is deserving of notice that in the Mahābhāṣya on these two Vārtikas Patañjali does not mention pacati bhavati, because he knows that this sentence is not there in Kātyāyana's language; even in his own days it has not, as is indicated by the nature of his inquiry का तर्हीयं वाचोयुक्तिः etc. gained sufficient ground. Moreover, Pacati bhavati is the object neither of Pluta nor of Nighāta[159] and no purpose will be served by discussing its Ekavākyatva here; he is therefore silent on that. But the later commentators who while accepting Pacati bhavati as an Ekavākya have to prevent Nighāta in it, are at pains to interpret the two definitions with regard to this sentence. They are therefore constrained to make a distinction[160] between Pacati bhavati and other

---

159. P. 8. 1. 28.
160. See the Mahābhāṣyā Pradīpa and Udyota on this; also vide the L. S. Mañjūṣā, p. 810.

sentences. According to them, Pacati bhavati is a Laukika (empirical) Vākya, not Śāstrīya, and is not therefore the object of Nighāta; but as we have seen above, neither Kātyāyana nor Patañjali knows this distinction between Laukika and Śāstrīya, not to speak of Pāṇini who has not touched upon this subject. What, therefore, seems reasonable to assume is that sentences like Pacati bhavati exist neither in Pāṇini's nor Kātyāyana's language, but come into vogue only in Patañjali's. Bhartṛhari seems to be the first grammarian to make this distinction between Laukikavākya and Śāstrīyavākya. Says he :

निपातादिव्यवस्थार्थं शास्त्रे यत्परिभाषितम् ।
साकाङ्क्षावयवं तेन न सर्वं तुल्यलक्षणम् ॥

Vākyapadiya 2. 3.

The following commentary on Vākyapadīya 2. 450 makes it plain that according to Kātyāyana, no Vākya consists of more than one verb. (indntical two verbs Tiṅantas excluded).

इह वार्तिककारेणाख्यातं साव्ययकारकविशेषणं वाक्यमित्यत्रैकवचनस्य विवक्षितत्वादेकतिङिति वाक्यलक्षणान्तरप्रतिपादनादाख्यातसद्भावे वाक्य-भेद एवेष्यते ।

So, in order to prevent Nighāta in it, the later commentators mark off Pacati bhavati from other sentences as pointed out above. In this respect they stick to Kātyāyana's definition and unreasonably question the necessity of saying 'atiṅ' in P. 8.1.28. But from the historical point of view, it is plain that Pāṇini does not know the sentence Pācati bhavati. His object in having 'atiṅ' in 8.1.21 is to avoid Nighāta when verbs belonging to different sentences happen to be placed side by side. He does not confine the operation of this rule to Samānavākya; and this is why the intelligent Patañjali, who knows Pāṇini better than any of his predecessors and successors gives under P. 8.1.28 Pacati[161] karoti and not Pacati bhavati as an instance pointing to the contrary.

Patañjali : अतिङ इति किमर्थम् । पचति करोति ।[162]

Kātyāyana : अतिङ्वचनमनर्थकं समानवाक्याधिकारात् ।

161. See also Patañjali on 8. 1. 11.
162. But Kāśikā and other later works give Pacati bhavati

Hari says :

एकतिङ् यस्य वाक्यं तु शास्त्रे नियतलक्षणम् ।
तस्यातिङ्ग्रहणेनार्थो वाक्यभेदान्न विद्यते ॥

Vākyapadīya 2.451

A further development

The idea of Ekavākyatva does not stop with Pacati bhavati, but expands further. In some later works[163], especially in those relating to the Śābdabodha philosophy, we often meet with Paśya mṛgo dhāvati which is regarded as one sentence by post-Patañjalian grammarians. But Naiyyāyikas and others do not in this respect agree with them. The former's position may be clarified like this. Generally Kriyā has Anvaya only with a Kāraka; but in certain cases one Kriyā can as well be the Karma or Kartā of another. In the former sentence, pacati is the Kartā of bhavati. In the latter the whole sentence Mṛgo dhāvati (meaning Mṛga-kartṛka-dhāvana, according to Vaiyyākaraṇas) is Karma in reference to paśya. The Śābdabodha will be Mṛga-kartṛka-dhāvana-karmakam darśanam.

It may be objected that as all Kriyās are Sādhyarūpas (not yet ready-made), one Kriyā cannot have Anvaya with another which is also of the same nature and that it has to be connected always with a Siddha (Dravya i. e. ready-made thing) which only can satisfy its expectancy. To this the grammarian replies as follows :-

क्रिया न युज्यते नित्यं क्रियानाधारकारकैः ।
असत्वरूपता तस्या इयमेवावधार्यताम् ॥

(Vākyapadīya. Kāṇḍa 3, p. 277)

When we say that Kriyās are Asatvarūpas and as such one Kriyā cannot directly connect itself with another, what we mean is that it has no direct Anvaya with Kārakas which are not Kriyādhāras.

It is necessary to explain what is ment by Kriyādhārakārakas. In the Śābdabodha analysis every Kriyā resolves itself into a

164. See Prauḍha-manoramā, Śabdaratna and Bhairavī Part I, pp-503; L.S. Mañjūṣā p. 797.

Vyāpāra and Phala (an operation and its result); Vyāpāra exists in its Kartā (the agent) and Phala in its Karma. For example, when we say Devadattaḥ taṇḍulam Pacati, Devadatta is the Āśraya of its Phala which is here Viklitti, i.e., softness or wetness produced in the rice. The direct Anvaya of a Kriyā is always with these two, namely, Kartā and Karma, which are said to be Kriyādhārakārakas. But it is not so with the other Kārakas. When we say Bhūmyāṃ āste Devadattaḥ the relation of Āsanakriyā to Adhikaraṇa (Bhūmi) is only through its Kartā. In the Vākyapadīya Hari says :

कर्तृकर्मव्यवहितामसाक्षाद्धारयत्क्रियाम् ।
उपकुर्वत्क्रियासिद्धौ शास्त्रेऽधिकरणं स्मृतम् ॥

In स्थाल्यां पचति तण्डुलम् Pākakriyā is related to Sthālī only through Taṇḍula. So also the other Kriyānādhārakārakas.

The Kriyāviśeṣaṇas. Why are they put in the accusative ?

It is in this analysis of Kriyā into Phala and Vyāpāra that we have to look for the explanation of Kriyāviśeṣaṇas and the reasons for putting them in the accusative. When we say ओदनं मृदुविशदं पचति, the Kriyāviśeṣaṇa—मृदुविशदम् does not stand for any modus operandi but only qualifies Phala, which is (as explained above) part of that Kriyā. It is according to the maxim व्यपदेशिवदेकस्मिन् that Phala is here spoken of as Kriyā and its Viśeṣaṇa as Kriyāviśeṣaṇa.

Now we can understand what is exactly meant by the apparently paradoxical (because Kriyāviśeṣaṇas are Avyayas) axiom क्रियाविशेषणानां कर्मत्वं नपुंसकलिङ्गता च, often quoted by grammarians. Kriyāviśeṣaṇas are treated as Karmakārakas in regard to the case in which they are to be put, because they qualify Phala which in its turn is directly related to Karma.

The object of the above analysis of Kriyā and Kriyāviśeṣaṇa is to point out that Kriyā has direct Anvaya only with Kartā and Karma. But it must be remembered that there is no restriction that this Kartā and Karma must be expressed only in nouns. In Śābdabodha meaning is far more important than the forms of the words, and it is quite sufficient even if these ideas are expressed by

verbs. In 'Pacati bhavati', pacati conveys the idea of Kartā. In Paśya mṛgo dhāvati either the verb dhāvati or the whole sentence Mṛgo dhāvati stands as Karma in reference to Paśya.

The position of the Munitraya in respect of Paśya mṛgo dhāvati

Unlike Pacati bhavati, this lacks the support of the Munitraya. It might have, of course, been there even in their times, but not as one sentence. The idea of Ekavākyatva regarding this (Paśya mṛgo dhāvati) originated prabably with Bhartṛhari. Patañjali's silence cannot be taken as a tacit consent, because in the passage referred to above, का तर्हीयं वाचोयुक्तिः etc, Patañjali speaks of verbs becoming only Kartās, and not Karmakārakas also; nowhere does he say that one Kriyā can be the Karma of another. The later commentators usually quote the following Mahābhāṣya in support of their view.

क्रियापि कृत्रिमं कर्म। क्रियापि क्रिययेप्सिता भवति। कया क्रियया? सन्दर्शनक्रियया वा प्रार्थयतिक्रियया वाध्यवस्यतिक्रियया वा। इह य एष मनुष्यः प्रेक्षापूर्वकारी भवति स बुद्ध्या तावत्कञ्चिदर्थं पश्यति, सन्दृष्टे प्रार्थना, प्रार्थनायामध्यवसायः, अध्यवसाय आरम्भः, आरम्भे निर्वृत्तिः। निर्वृत्तौ फलावाप्तिः। एवं क्रियापि कृत्रिमं कर्म॥

(1.4.32)

Nāgeśa takes the first sentence and in order to find some justification for the Ekavākyatva of Paśya mṛgo dhāvati, misconstrues[165] it to mean that even one verb can be the Karma of another. The correct interpretation is given by Kaiyaṭa which is as follows :

प्रतीयमानक्रियापेक्षः कारकभावः प्रविश पिण्डीमित्यादाविवात्रेति भावः।

What Patañjali exactly means is this : In instances like the above Kriyā can also, in a secondary sense, be called Karma. Here every succeeding Kriyā is inferred from the preceding one and on account of their Niyata-paurvāparya, the preceding one is said to be the cause of the succeeding one, i.e., one Kriyā implies another of which it is a necessary predecessor and in this sense the succeeding Kriyā is said to be the Karma of the one preceding it. In the parallel instances given by Kaiyaṭa, geham and bhakṣaya are implied

165. See the L. S. Mañjūṣā, p. 797.

respectively. From the extract given below it may be seen that Patañjali says this in quite a different context which in no way throws any light on the Ekavākyatva of Paśya mṛgo dhāvati and that Kaiyaṭa's interpretation is correct.

क्रियाग्रहणमपि कर्तव्यम् । इहापि यथा स्यात्–श्राद्धाय निगर्हते । युद्धाय सन्नह्यते : पत्ये शेत इति । तर्त्हि वक्तव्यम् । न वक्तव्यम् । कथम् । क्रियां हि लोके कर्मेत्युपचरन्ति । कां क्रियां करिष्यसि । किं कर्म करिष्यसीति । एवमपि वक्तव्यम् । कृत्रिमाकृत्रिमयोः कृत्रिमे संप्रत्ययो भवति । क्रियापि कृत्रिमं कर्म । न सिद्धयति । कर्तुरीप्सिततमं कर्म (1.4.49) इत्युच्यते; कथं च नाम क्रियया क्रियेप्सिततमा स्यात् । क्रियापि क्रिययेप्सिततमा भवति । कया क्रियया । सन्दर्शनक्रियया वा प्रार्थयतिक्रियया वाध्यवस्यतिक्रियया वा । इह य एष मनुष्यः प्रेक्षापूर्वकारी भवति स बुद्ध्या तावत्कञ्चिदर्थं संपश्यति । सन्दृष्टे प्रार्थना । प्रार्थनायामध्यवसायः । अध्यवसाय आरम्भः । आरम्भे निर्वृत्तिः । निर्वृत्तौ फलावाप्तिः । एवं क्रियापि कृत्रिमं कर्म ॥

Following Kātyāyanā's definition Patañjali at another place says that there is no instance of the use of a second Tiṅanta in a Samānavākya (in the same sentence). All this has been made very clear by Bhojadeva in his Sṛṅgāraprakāśa.[166] Bhartṛhari gives two other types of sentences in which Ekavākyatva has to be accepted for some technical purposes explained by him :

सम्बोधनपदं यच्च तत्क्रियाया विशेषकम् ।
व्रजानि देवदत्तेति निघातोऽत्र तथा सति ॥

(Ibid. 2.5)

The commentator introduces this as follows :—

व्रजानि देवदत्तेत्यत्र देवदत्तेत्येतत्पदं नाव्ययं, न च कारकं, नापि तद्विशेषण-मिति वाक्यलक्षणेनासङ्गृहीतत्वादाष्टमिक आमन्त्रितस्य चेति निघातो न प्राप्नोतीति चोद्यम् ॥

He proceeds to point out that if the meaning of Saviśeṣaṇa is widened a little so as to mean both Samānādhikarāṇa and Vyadhikaraṇa Viśeṣaṇas this type of sentence can also be covered by the Vārtikakāra's definition आख्यातं साव्यय etc. He then explains[167]

---

166. Prakāśa 3, Adayar Library Transcript, Vol. 1 p. 398 (No. 39 F. 2)
167. P. 69.

how Devadatta is a Vyadhikaraṇa Viśeṣaṇā of Vrajāni, and how the definition holds good in this case. There is of course nothing in this sentence to indicate that it comes into vogue very late; but the recognition of Ekavākyatva in it is post-Patañjalian. Neither Kātyāyana nor Patañjali intends to cover this. Patañjali, while instancing the Vārtika आख्यातं साव्यय etc., does not refer to any sentence in which Kriyā is qualified by a Vyadhikaraṇaviśeṣaṇa. It is usual with later commentators to try to find support in the words of the Munitraya for everything which they have to account for; and in this endeavour they often misconstrue the texts.

So far we have seen sentences consisting only of two verbs. In the following example we have three, the last one being qualified temporally (Kālaviśeṣaṇaviśiṣṭa) by the preceding two. Bhartṛhari points out the analogy of Ktvāntas of which any number can be used in a sentence. In this type, too, Ekavākyatva comes to be recognised only after Patañjali's time. According to Patañjali no Ekavākya[168] consits of two or more verbs, with the exception of that of the type of Pacati bhavati. Says Hari in the Vākyapadīya:

यथानेकमपि क्त्वान्तं तिङन्तस्य विशेषकम् ।
तथा तिङन्तं तत्राहुस्तिङन्तस्य विशेषकम् ॥

पूर्वं स्नाति पचति ततो व्रजति ततः ।

The commentator adds :

नास्त्यत्र वाक्यभेदः । व्रजतीत्येतत्प्राधान्येनैकं क्रियापदमत्र स्थितम् । अन्यानि क्रियान्तराणि तद्विशेषणान्येव ॥

(P. 70)

What we have to note here

Though I have incidentally discussed all the types of Ekavākya, my basic intention is to point out only the type of Pacati bhavati which can come into vogue in a spoken language alone. We find that even after Patañjali's time the Sanskrit language undergoes not only phonetic and morphological but syntactic changes as well. This indicates that the language which is full of life and flux during Patañjali's time continues in that state for sometime after him; for

168. Cf. न च सामान्यवाक्ये द्वे तिङन्ते स्तः (the Mahābhāṣya on P. 8.1 28)

such changes cannot overtake a language which is dead and confined to literary compositions. The conclusion is further strengthened by the fact that Kātyāyana and Patañjali, while speaking of language as a source from which words can be learnt without the help of grammar, refer[169] to Sanskrit as Loka, i.e., the empirical speech; if it is not a spoken language in their times, the term Loka which Kātyāyana and Patañjali use would be insignificant. Moreover, if Kātyāyana's and Patañjali's object is only to recast the grammar of a language which is no more used in daily intercourse, the problem of Apaśabdas with which both of them are so much concerned at the outset of their respective works, cannot arise; neither can the distinction made between Ācāra and Jñāna serve any concrete purpose so far as a language confined to written compositions is concerned. The language of the Mahābhāṣya itself is a great argument in favour of this. It preserves the spring and the young vigour of a tongue buoyant with life and bears on it the traces of the living contact it maintains with the reality of speech.

Proceeding from the historical to the academic side of the Mahābhāṣya, we have to discuss in the next chapter certain important Paribhāṣās and Nyāyas, the adoption of which enables Patañjali to reject a number of Vārtikas. These Paribhāṣās and Nyāyas clearly bring out the difference between himself and Kātyāyana in the technique of interpreting Pāṇini.

---

169. See Paspaśā, p. 5; also pp. 7–8; Cf. सिद्धे शब्दार्थसंबन्धे etc. They use this term not only here but also in a number of other places in their respective works.

CHAPTER VII

Patañjalian Technique of Interpretation—Use of Paribhāṣās and Nyāyas :

The use of a good many Paribhāṣās and Nyāyas (some of which are of his own making) enable Patañjali not only to reject a large number of Kātyāyana Vārtikas but also to widen the scope of the Aṣṭādhyāyī further. A few important among these are illustrated below :

1. व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्नहि संदेहादलक्षणम् ।

When Pāñini uses an ambiguous term, its precise meaning is to be ascertained from learned interpretation, and Pāṇini's grammar (which is a Śāstra should teach definite things) does not, because of some ambiguous terms, becomes Alakṣaṇa or Apramāṇa. We learn from interpretation that the Pratyāhāra 'Aṇ' except in P. 1. 1. 69[170] is formed with 'ṇ' of the first Sūtra of the Akṣarasamāmnāya. Pāṇini who, instead of using different sounds occasions ambiguity by employing the same letter in अ इ उ ण् and लण् whenever 'Aṇ' and Iṇ are used,, really intends to teach this important maxim. Patañjali makes use of this Paribhāṣā in various ways. In fact, the new interepretations which he places upon a good many Sūtras and which enable him to reject a number of Kātyāyana Vārtikas can be explained by being referred to this Paribhāṣā.[171] A few illustrations are given below.

(a) Pāṇini 1. 4. 9. (विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम्) says that when there is

170. See Patañjali on this Sūtra.
171. For other instances see the Māhabhāṣya on P. 1.3.10, 1.3.11, 3. 2. 57, 3. 2 58 and 7. 1. 13. In all these places Patañjali points out that an authoritative interpretation removes all doubts :

संदेहमात्रमेतद्भवति । सर्वसंदेहेषु चेदमुपतिष्ठते-व्याख्यानतो विशेष प्रतिपत्तिः.............. ।

opposition between two Sūtras, both of equal force, the one that holds good is that which is read later.

This is the first interpretation. In certain cases which require the application of the Sūtras read earlier, Kātyāyana who does not go beyond this interpretation, had to add Vārtikas to say that in those particular instances, the Pūrva holds good. To Patañjali 'para' means not only read later but also Iṣṭa, i. e., that which is demanded by the occasion. All the Vārtikas which Kātyāyana intends as exceptions to P. 1. 4. 9 are rejected by Patañjali, following this second interpretation. On P. 1. 4. 2. (V. 7) Patañjali says :

अस्तीष्टवाची परशब्दः । तद्यथा-परं धाम गत इति ॥

For example, see the Mahābhāṣya on P. 4.1.85, 5.1.2, 6.1.12, 6.1.158 and 7.1.1.

(b) *Interpretation of the particle 'ca'*

The interpretation of the particle 'ca' as demanded by the occasion often helps Patañjali to refute the Vārtikas. In P. 2. 1. 48 (पात्रे समितादयश्च) and 2. 1. 72 (मयूरव्यंसकादयश्च) he takes 'ca' as standing for the meaning of 'eva', but in P. 2. 2. 14 (कर्मणि च) he takes it as conveying the sense of 'iti'. All this examplifies the above maxim.

(c) *The meanings of the word anta*

Patañjali says that this word has two meanings, viz., Avayava and Samīpa, and that Pāṇini in 1.2.10 (हलन्ताच्च) uses it in the latter one, i. e., Samīpa. Thus he answers the objection of some of his predecessors who take it here in the former sense.

(d) *The use of bahulam, anyatarasyām, etc.*

Pāṇini's grammar is Sarvavedapāriṣada and as such, connot always cling to strictly uniform methods and devices. It has to make use of such words as bahulam, vā, etc., in order to account for all irregularities.

अवश्यं खल्वप्यस्माभिरिदं वक्तव्यं बहुलमन्यतरस्यामुभयथा एकेषामिति ।
सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्था शक्य आस्थातुम्,

says Patañjali on P. 2. 1. 58 and 6. 3. 14.

The interpretation of bahulam, anyatarasyām, etc., as required by the occasion, enables Patañjali to account[172] for all irregularities. Kātyāyana who on both these Sūtras says बहुलवचनस्याकृत्स्नत्वात्, takes that word in its original sense.

Explanation of Vedic anomalies.

The irregularities, in the use of case affixes, personal endings, Parasmaipada and Ātmanepada terminations, etc., are so numerous in the Vedic language that it is not possible for a few rules to cover them all. Pāṇini treats them only in a cursory manner. Patañjali, according to whom Pāṇini's grammar is Sarvavedapāriśada, (2.1.58) finds in Pāṇini a justification for all these anomalies. He splits व्यत्ययो बहुलम्, P. 3. 1. 85, into two Sūtras : Vyatyayaḥ, and bahulam. The former, in accordance with the context, enjoins the interchangeablity of Vikaraṇas in certain cases in the Vedas. The latter, i. e., bahulam is not bound by the context and means that all rules take effect diversely in the Vedic language. All anomalies are thus explained by 'bahulam'.

[173]सुप्तिङुपग्रहलिङ्गनराणां कालहलच्स्वरकर्तृयङां च ।
व्यत्ययमिच्छति शास्त्रकृदेषां सोऽपि च सिद्ध्यति बाहुलकेन ॥

As has already been pointed out, Pāṇini uses the word 'bahulam' in its original sense 'often'.[174] Devices like the above intended to cover anomalies, give it later a very liberal sense, viz.. 'diversely'. Hence the later commentators say :

---

172. See Patañjali on P. 2 1. 50 and 6. 3. 14.
173. By Upagraha are meant the Ātmanepada and Parsmaipada terminations. Yañ here is a Pratyāhāra with the ya of P. 3.1.3.22 and the 'ñ' of 3.1 86. Examples are found in the Mahābhāṣya on P. 3.1.85. See also Patañjali on 1.4.9. and 2.1.32.
174. Kātyāyana also says बहुलवचनस्याकृत्स्नत्वात्. See P. 2.1.58 and 6.3.14.

[175]क्वचित्प्रवृत्तिः क्वचिदप्रवृत्तिः क्वचिद्विभाषा क्वचिदन्यदेव ।
विधेर्विधानं वहुधा समीक्ष्य चतुर्विधं बाहुलकं वदन्ति ॥

(e) यथा न दोपस्तथास्तु ।

When two alternatives present themselves to us and the Śāstra (Pāṇini) does not expressly say which we should choose, we (as intelligent human beings) must adopt only that which is faultless. If a rule is capable of two interpretations, we have to choose that interpretation which lands us in no difficulty. Patañjali reiterates this axiom very often in the Mahābhāṣya and rejects[176] a good many Vārtikas.

(f) अधिकारा अनुवर्तेरन् ।

Refuting the Vārtika वदःसुप्यनुपसर्गग्रहणम् (P. 3.1.106, V. 1) which states that the word anupasarga must be added to this Sūtra Patañjali says :

न वक्तव्यम् । अनुपसर्गं इति वर्तते । एवं तर्ह्यन्वाचष्टेऽनुपसर्गं इति वर्तत इति । [177]नैतदन्वाख्येमपधिकारा अनुवर्तन्त इति । एष एव न्यायो यदुताधिकारा अनुवर्तेरन्निति ।

What Patañjali exactly means is this that instead of saying that Adhikāras do follow, it must be said that Adhikāras may follow as and when they are required. The Adhikāras can thus be taken over to any distant Sūtra even without connecting them with the intervening Sūtras. The application[178] of Adhikārasūtras is thus liberalised by Patañjali to a great extent.

अधिकारो नाम त्रिप्रकारः ।

Patañjali divides Adhikāras into three classes, taking that term in a wider sense.

(1) That which like a lamp stands in a corner of the Śāstra and illumines the whole of it. By this Patañjali means Paribhāṣās. The Mahābhāṣya on P. 2.1.1 makes this very clear.

---

175. Prakriyāprasāda of Viṭṭhala, Part II, p. 599.
176. See Patañjali on P. 1.4.57, 4.1.85, 2 4.12 etc.
177. Vide also Patañjali on P. 6.1.20 and 6.1.17.
178. Cf. also Patañjali on P. 2.4.34 अथवा मण्डूकगतयोऽधिकाराः । तद्यथा-मण्डूका उत्प्लुत्योत्प्लुत्य गच्छन्ति तद्वदधिकाराः ।

[179]परिभाषा पुनरेकदेशस्था सती सर्वं शास्त्रमभिज्वलयति प्रदीपवत् ।।

(2) That which is dragged by 'ca' from one Sūtra to another as a log of wood is drawn by a chain or a rope.

(3) That in which the necessity of repeating it (the same words) in every Sūtra with which it has to be connected is not felt. This is the usual Adhikāra which is connected uniformly with the desired number of Sūtras following it.

Though śāsaḥ in P. 6.4.34 (शास इदङ् हलोः) stands for Avayava-ṣaṣṭhī in that Sūtra it can be taken over to the next one and interpreted as Sthānaṣaṣṭhī. Its repetition in the next rule is thus avoided. This Adhikāra falls into the third category,

This threefold definition of the Adhikāras enlarges their scope a great deal and they are used as required[180] by the occasion. Patañjali thus rejects the Vārtika विशिष्टा वा षष्ठी स्थानेयोगा ।

Says he :

तद्यदैष पक्षोऽधिकारः प्रतियोगं तस्यानिर्देशार्थं इति तदा हि यदेवादः पुरस्तादवयवषष्ठ्यर्थमेतदुत्तरत्रानुवृत्तं सत्स्थानेयोगार्थं भविष्यति ।

(P. 1.1.49, V. 4)

(2) सत्यपि संभवे बाधनं भवति ।

According to Kātyāyana, an Apavāda (special rule)[181] when there is a conflict between the two, supersedes an Utsarga i. e. when there is no possibility of both taking effect together. According to Patañjali, an Apavāda supersedes an Utsarga even when there is no conflict between them, i.e., even when there would be room for the

179. See Vol. 1, p. 359 (Kielhorn's edition). See also Patañjali on P. 8.3.37 (V. 2) and 5.1 1.
180. See also Patañjali on P. 8.3.37 (V. 2) and 5.1.1.
181. See Kaiyaṭa on 2.3.1. and the Paribhāṣenduśekhara, Paribhāṣās 52 and 58. Kaiyaṭa says : विरोधे बाधकारणं न विशेषविधानमेव । वार्तिककारस्य चेदं दर्शनम् । भाष्यकारस्तु विरोधाभावेऽपि विशेषविधानमात्रेणैव बाधकत्वमन्यत्रावोचत्–तक्रदानं च दधिदानस्य विरोधाभावेऽपि लोके बाधकं दृश्यते ।।

operation of the Apavāda after the taking effect of the Utsārga. Patañjali quotes the Takrakauṇḍinya maxim in support of his view.

सत्यपि संभवे बाधनं भवति । तद्यथा–दधि ब्राह्मणेभ्यो दीयतां तक्रं कौण्डिन्यायेति सत्यपि संभवे दधिदानस्य तक्रदानं निवर्तकं भवति.....................॥

(Patañjali on P. 6.1.2, V. 4)

When it is said 'Let curds be given to Brahmins, but buttermilk to Kauṇḍinya', Kauṇḍinya is given only buttermilk, although it is possible to give him both curds and buttermilk, the one after or before the other. The following is an illustration.

P. 6.1.1. एकाचो द्वे प्रथमस्य ।

In a root containing a single vowel, the first syllable is reduplicated. P. 6.1.2. अजादेर्द्वितीयस्य In a root beginning with a vowel and consisting of more than one syllable, the second syllable is reduplicated. This is an exception to the first rule.

In[182] the case of a root which begins with a vowel, the first rule is superseded by the second, although it is possible for the latter to take effect after the operation of the former. In instances like aṭiṭiṣati aśiśiṣati, etc., there is a possibility of both taking effect (अस्ति च संभवो यदुभयं स्यात्)

Patañjali says :

यदप्युच्यतेऽप्राप्ते खल्वपि संभवे बाधनं भवति । अस्ति च संभवो यदुभयं स्यादिति । नैतदस्ति । सत्यपि संभवे बाधनं भवति । तद्यथा–दधि ब्राह्मणेभ्यो दीयतां तक्रं कौण्डिन्यायेति सत्यपि दधिदानस्य संभवे तक्रदानं निवर्तकं भवति । एवमिहापि सत्यपि संभवे प्रथमद्विर्वचनस्य द्वितीयद्विर्वचनं बाधिष्यते ।

(P. 6.1.2, V. 4)

For other examples, see the Mahābhāṣya on P. 6.2.1., 6.4.163, 7.1.72 and 7.4.61. In all these instances Patañjali adopts this Takrakauṇḍinya maxim and makes it the main item of his difference with Kātyāyana.

---

182. E. G. aṭiṭisati, aśiśiṣati, etc., desiderative forms of aṭ, aś, etc., which, begin with a vowel, When the desiderative affix 'san' and the augment iṭ are added to them, they cease to be monosyllabic.

3. *The Sūtraśāṭaka maxim*

Both Kātyāyana and Patañjali are agreed on the Nityatva of Śabdas. The acceptance of this doctrine helps us to overcome the Anyonyāśraya (i e,. interdependence when either of the two things cannot be known apart from the other) in many cases. For instance when Pānini says वृद्धिरादैच् , we are faced with an Anyonyāśraya; the term Vṛddhi can be introduced only if the sounds ā, ai and au to which it applies, already exist; on the other hand, the existence of these sounds becomes cognisable only when they are taught through the use of the term Vṛddhi. To solve the riddle, it is accepted that Śabdas are Nityas. In other words, it is the Saṃjñās which are Anityās[183] that are newly taught here, and not the Śabdas which are Nityas and to which these Saṃjñās apply.

But[184] difficulty is felt in instances like इग्यणः संप्रसारणम् (P.1. 1, 45) in which certain sounds receive a Saṃjñā only when they replace their respective Sthānins. For instance, Ik receives the Saṃprasāraṇasaṃjñā only when it replaces Yaṇ. When we say that 'ik' receives the Saṃprasāranasaṃjñā when it replaces Yaṇ, the statement seems to be absurd, because at this stage Ik has yet to come into existence by replacing[185] Yaṇ. 'Ik' must be there if it is to

---

183. Cf. Patañjali on P. 2.1.51 (V. 4) : न हि संज्ञा नित्या
184. Cf. Patañjali on P. 1.1.45 (V. 3) :
नेदं तुल्यमन्यैरितरेतराश्रयैः । न हि तत्र किञ्चिदुच्यतेऽस्य स्थाने य आकारैकारौ-कारा भाव्यन्ते ते वृद्धिसंज्ञा भवन्ति इति ॥
185. The replacement of one sound by another sins against the doctrine of immutability of Śabdas. Sūtras like इको यणचि (P. 6.1.77) etc., have therefore to be interpreted thus : When there is occasion (Prasakti) for the use of Ik etc., Yaṇ etc., must be used.

Cf. सर्वे सर्वपदादेशा दाक्षीपुत्रस्य पाणिनेः ।
एकदेशविकारे हि नित्यत्वं नोपपद्यते ॥

So there is no actual replacement but only the use of इक् etc., when there is occasion for that of Yaṇ, etc. It is really the Prasaṅga that is Anitya and not the Śabda concerned. The immutability of Śabdas does not solve the riddle of Saṃprasāraṇsaṃjñā because 'Ik' becomes Saṃprasāraṇa only after it is used-in a case in w ich there was Prasaṅga for Yaṇ and not before. In Sūtras like ष्यङः सम्प्रसारणं पुत्रपत्योस्तत्पुरुषे

be made the Uddeśya (object of the Vidheya, i. e. Samprasāraṇa-saṃjñā). Kātyāyana has no solution for this. But Patañjali who intelligently recognises the difference between Saṃjñās of this type and those of the type of Vṛiddhi introduces the Sūtraśāṭaka maxim to solve the difficulty mentioned above. What this maxim means is this: When one asks the weaver to weave a piece of cloth out of some yarn, one is indulging in what is a prima facie absurdity. The use of the word cloth presupposes the existence of a piece, so if it is a piece of cloth that is referred to, weaving is both unnecessary and impossible; if what is to be woven is yarn, the piece of cloth need not be mentioned at all. The real explanation of this is that the word cloth is used in a prospective (Bhāvi) application; it is used rather to refer to the finished product which is non-existent when the weaver is given the instruction.

4. व्यपदेशिवदेकस्मिन्

Patañjali widens the scope of its application

This maxim is very frequently used by the Pāṇinīyas. It is favoured by both Kātyāyana and Patañjali. Kātyāyana[186] uses it to mean that a part is treated as a whole. If a dog loses its tail, it does not cease to be called a dog: it does not become a different animal. This is the stock example of all commentators. In his Bhāṣya on the Vārtika लक्ष्यलक्षणे व्याकरणम्[187] which means that the term Vyākaraṇa stands for the totality of Lakṣya and Lakṣaṇa, Patañjali says that the principle of Vyapadeśivadbhāva justifies the use व्याकरणस्य सूत्रम्।

The difference between this and the other usual instances,[188] though very subtle, is nevertheless very important. In all other

(P. 6.1.13) in which it is said that Saṃprasāraṇa must be used in those instances where there is a Prasaṅga for Yaṇ, this term is used with a prospective application.

186. See P. 6.1.1. (V. 2) एकवर्णेषु व्यपदेशिवद्वचनात् Eeven one vowel is treated as an Ekāc (Bahuvrīhi) meaning a Samudāya or an Avayavin of which an Ac or a vowel is a part. e.g. iyāya, the Liṭ form in which the root 'i' (to go) is reduplicated (एकाचो द्वे प्रथमस्य) being treated as an Ekāc.

187. Paspaśā 1.4

188. As that given in the above foot note in which 'i' is treated as an Ekāc.

instances of Vyapadeśivadbāva, the wholeness of a thing is superimposed on its part and the part is consequently treated as a whole; in this case, however, the same[189] thing is spoken of both as Avayavin and Avayava. The possessive case always indicates the relation of two actually different things. Kaiyaṭa[190] gives another example, viz. राहोः शिरः[191]

Patañjali thus widens the scope of the application of this principle by using it in an instance in which the same thing is spoken of both as an Avayavin and an Avayava.

5. एकान्ता अनुबन्धाः and अनेकान्ता अनुबन्धाः ।
Kātyāyana gives both but Patañjali accepts only the former

Under P.1.3.9 Kātyāyana and Patañjali give the Pribhāṣās एकान्ता अनुबन्धाः and अनेकान्ता अनुबन्धाः i.e., whether Anubandhas are or are not part of that to which they are attached. Kātyāyana on assuming that Anubandhas do not form part of the terms to which they are attached but merely stand beside them, is confronted with a difficulty in rules like P. 4.2.80 (वुञ्छण्कठजिलसेनिरढञ्ण्यय........) etc., in which 'ṇ' on accout of its equal proximity to both the following and preceding affixes, would be connected with both and consequently the operation which results from an affix having the indicatory letter 'ṇ' will take place both in the case of 'ch' and in that of 'k'. The Vārtikakāra gives the following solution for this difficulty.

सिद्धं तु व्यवसितपाठात् ।

Patañjali explains :

सिद्धमेतत् । कथम् ? व्यवसितपाठः कर्तव्यः । वुञ्छण्............॥

What Kātyāyana means is that they (the affixes referred to above) must be read distinctly, i. e., without blending the indicatory letter of one affix with the other and confusing their functions. But

189. Vyākaraṇa and Sūtra mean the same thing. See Patañjali on the Vārtika लक्ष्यलक्षणे व्याकरणम् ।
190. See the Mahābhāṣya, Pradīpa and Udyota on the above Vārtika.
191. According to mythology, Rāhu is Dragon's head; so both refer to the same thing.

Patañjali does not admit the necessity for this Vyavasitapāṭha. He thinks that the difficulty can be overcome through right interpretation. Says he :

संदेह[192] मात्रमेतद्भवति । सर्वसंदेहेषु चेदमुपतिष्ठते व्याख्यानतो विशेष-प्रतिपत्तिर्नहि संदेहादलक्षणमिति व्याख्यास्यामः ।

Though Kātyāyana gives both the views, Patañjali accepts only the former which he thinks is more reasonable[193] than the latter.

Patañjali[194] उभयमिदमनुबन्धेषूक्तमेकान्ता अनेकान्ता इति । किमत्र न्याय्यम् । एकान्ता इत्येव न्याय्यम् ।

6. सूत्रे लिङ्गवचनमतन्त्रम् ।

In Sūtra 1.2.53 (तदशिष्यं संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात्) Pāṇini himself points out that the gender and number of a word depend on usage and that no hard and fast rule can be laid down by grammar with regard to them. The same latitude can with all justification be extented to the words of his Sūtras which are placed by him in genders and numbers having no grammatical importance. But as regards those of the latter, Kātyāyana is sometimes very particular as in his critical Vārtikas on P. 3.3.18 (given below) and sometimes not as in his Vārtika on P. 4.1.92 तद्धितार्थनिर्देशे लिङ्गवचनमप्रमाणं तस्याविवक्षितत्वात् । Patañjali lays down this definite maxim and holds to it throughout. What this maxim सूत्रे लिङ्गवचनमतन्त्रम् means is this :—

We can have neither grain without chaff, nor words without gender and number. When a word used to state a rule is placed by Pāṇini in a particular number and gender, these last have no grammatical importance; the word can as well be in any other number or gender. The acceptance of this axiom leads Patañjali to reject Kātyāyana in some places. The following is an instance.

P. 3.3.18 भावे ।

---

192. See Patañjali on P. 1.3.9. V. 14
193. See Patañjali on P. 1.3.9, V. 15 and 3.1.94, V. 6
194. See under P. 1.3.9, V. 15

Kātyāyana : भावे सर्वलिङ्गो निर्देशः ।

Patañjali : भावे सर्वलिङ्गो निर्देशः कर्तव्यः । भूतौ भवने भाव इति । किं प्रयोजनम् । सर्वलिङ्गे भावे एते प्रत्यया यथा स्युरिति । किं पुनः कारणं न सिद्ध्यति । पुंल्लिङ्गेनायं निर्देशः क्रियते एकवचनान्तेन च । तेन पुल्लिङ्ग एव भाव एकवचने चैते प्रत्ययाः स्युः । स्त्रीनपुंसकयोः द्विवचनबहुवचनयोश्च न स्युः ॥

नात्र निर्देशस्तन्त्रम् । कथं पुनस्तेनैव च नाम निर्देशः क्रियते तच्चातन्त्रं स्यात् । तत्कारी च भवांस्तद्द्वेषी च । नान्तरीयकत्वादत्र पुल्लिङ्गेन निर्देशः क्रियते एकवचनेन च । अवश्यं कयाचिद्विभक्तया केनचिच्च लिङ्गेन निर्देशः कर्तव्यः । तद्यथा–कश्चिदन्नार्थी शालिकलापं सतुषं सपलालमाहरति नान्तरीयकत्वात् ॥

7. संनियोगशिष्टानामन्यतरापाय उभयोरप्यभावः ।

When one of the two things taught together disappears, then the other follows suit. When we say that this work must be done by Yajñadatta and Devadatta, we mean that it must be done together by both. The one does not do it in the absence of the other. This is another Paribhāṣā which Patañjali uses to make up the deficiencies in the Sūtras. According to him, this is suggested by P. 6. 4. 153.

[195] (बिल्वकादिभ्यश्छस्य लुक्) ।

Pāṇini's object in having the augmented form bilvaka in this Sūtra is to teach that 'cha' alone shall be elided and not the augment Kuk: otherwise the augment 'kuk' would also be elided on the strength of this maxim. Bilva becomes bilvaka when the augment is added to it (according to P. 4. 2. 29).

बिल्वादिभ्यः would have been quite suficient. The force of the admission of the augmented form is that it alone shall be elided and not the augment added together with it. Under P. 4. 1. 36 Kātyāyana points out the necessity of stating that the Āgamas and Ādeśas taught together with some Strīpratyayas follow suit when the latter are dropped. Patañjali thinks that such a statement is not necessary, as it is a matter that may be learnt from everyday life. Says he :

---

195. Vide the Mahābhāṣya on P. 2.2.6, 2.1·36, 2.2.29, 2.4.12 and 5.4.16.

[196]तर्त्हि वक्तव्यम् ? न वक्तव्यम् । संनियोगशिष्टानामन्यतरापाय उभयोरप्यभावः । तद्यथा देवदत्तयज्ञदत्ताभ्यामिदं कर्म कर्तव्यम् । देवदत्तापाये यज्ञदत्तोऽपि न करोति ।

8. शब्दान्तरस्य प्राप्नुवन्विधिरनित्यो भवति ।

A rule is Anitya if the wordform to which it applies differs from what it was before another simultaneously applying rule took effect. This is another important maxim introduced by Patañjali. In the formation of the word nyaviśata P. 6. 4. 71 which teaches the augment 'aṭ' and P. 3. 1. 77 which teaches the Vikarana 'śa', apply simultaneously. If the Vikaraṇa is added first to the root, the augment would be prefixed to viśa and not to 'viś', i. e., to that which ends with the Vikaraṇa; otherwise it would be added only to 'viś'; hence P. 6. 4. 71 is said to be Anitya.

This Paribhāṣā enables Patañjali to regulate[197] the application of some Sūtras and leads him to reject some Vārtikas. Instances are found in the Mahābhāṣya on P. 1.3.60 V. 3, 2.4.35 V.3, etc.

9. प्रत्येकं वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिः and समुदाये वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिः ।
Patañjali champions the latter and accounts for certain compounds

Kātyāyana says that the addition of saha to P. 2. 1. 4 (सह सुपा) is to indicate that the term Samāsa applies to a compound (i. e., to a group of words) as a whole and not to individual parts thereof. According to him, in the absence of this word in this Sūtra the term Samāsa would (like the term Vṛddhi taught in वृद्धिरादैच् P. 1. 1. 1) apply to the individual parts of a compound. The Vārtikakāra thus champions प्रत्येकं वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिः, i. e., (individual application) in his following Vārtika on P. 2. 1. 4.

सहवचनं पृथगसमासार्थम् ।

Patañjali explains :

सहग्रहणंक्रियते सहभूतयोः समाससंज्ञा यथा स्यादेकैकस्य मा भूदिति । कथं च कृत्वैकैकस्य वृद्धिसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति । प्रत्येकं वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिर्दृष्टेति ॥

Patañjali does not agree with Kātyāyana. He points out to the latter that in certain cases rules have also collective application, e.g., गर्गाः शतं दण्ड्यन्ताम्. When it is ordered by a king that the Gargas

196. See also Patañjali on P. 5. 1. 64 (Vol. II, p. 357).
197. In accordance with the Paribhāṣā.

shall be fined one hundred coins, what is meant is that the total fine to be collected from all the Gargas must be one hundered and not that each Garga should be made to pay a fine of one hundred coins. The number of the coins is more important than the number of Gargas. An [198]unimportant thing is repeated as many times as required by the number of the important one to which it is applied, but not vice versa.

Cf. [199]अर्थिनश्च राजानो हिरण्येन भवन्ति ।
न च प्रत्येकं दण्डयन्ति ॥

After criticising Kātyāyana in this way Patañjali shows how a better purpose can be served by saha in the above Sūtra. He splits the Sūtra into two: Saha and Supa. The former, i. e., Saha means that Sup is compounded with any word that is Samartha. [200]This covers all such compounds in which one member is not a Sup (but is Samartha, i. e., connected in sense) and for which Pāṇini has no rules to account for, e. g., punarutsyūta, punarniṣkṛta, etc.. Patañjali thus extends the scope of the Samāsas.

This subject which contains material abundant enough for a separate study has been touched upon here only where it relates to the main thesis. Its vastness makes it impossible for one to exhaust all its aspects within the compass of a chapter like this. The important intention here has been rather to stress how by introducing several Nyāyas and Paribhāṣās, Patañjali frees the interpretation of the Aṣṭādhyāyī from all its narrowness and liberalises and broad-bases it. Patañjali throws overboard a number of Vārtikas *not by choice but from necessity.* Patañjali is not attempting any cheap heterodoxy. His rejection of the Vārtikas is incidental to the task he shoulders of widening the Pāṇinian interpretation, and is no part of any wanton rebellion against the achieved conclusions of the past.

Kātyāyana's differences with Pāṇini and Patañjali's differences with Kātyāyana are dictated by purely historical and academic reasons; neither of them intends to carp at his predecessor or to indulge in craft-compliment.

---

198. This Nyāya is well-known among Mimāṃsakas.
199. See also Patañjali on P. 1. 1. 1. (V. 12).
200. See the Mahābhāṣya on this Sūtra.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

There is an appearance of opposition between Kātyāyana and Patañjali; but it is only an appearance, and the opposition is nothing more than a difference. Both Kātyāyana and Patañjali attempt to span the gulf between themselves and their predecessors, but in two different ways. Unlike Patañjali, Kātyāyana never tries to do more than to enable Pāṇini's work to cover the changes which took place in the language after Pāṇini's and before his own time: Kātyāyana never attains Patañjali's width of gaze, never tries to make Pāṇini explain the possible changes in what must have been to him the future of the language. Kātyāyana's method is tentative and static; in broadening the scope of the Aṣṭādhyāyī he emends and supplements it. Patañjali's way is more organic. An addition or an emendation is with him only a last resort. He has recourse to it only if after exploring all the aspects of Pāṇini's meaning, he has found that a certain change is not provided for in Pāṇini. Patañjali not only illumines the darkest corners of meaning in Pāṇini and exploits the possibilities of his work to the maximum extent, but confers an unassailable fixity on Pāṇini's authority by establishing his text under certain protective principles (mostly drawn from the text, i. e., the Aṣṭādhyāyī itself) which are so comprehensive as to make Pāṇini's work include in itself the explanations for the changes in the past, present and future of the language. Patañjali has made Pāṇini valid and active for all times and has put an irrevocable stop to the method of which Kātyāyana was very often guilty—of emending and supplementing interminably. The charge of unwarranted critical rancour against Kātyāyana has often been laid at Patañjali's doors. The justification for the rancour perhaps lies in the fact that it was dictated by an anxiety to make Pāṇini's text enlarged and safe. In all Sanskrit no author owes more to his commentator than Pāṇini does to Patañjali.

Pāṇini's grammar has been to Sanskrit language what Art is to life. As painting :—

"For the sight of mortal man has given
To one brief moment caught from fleeting time
The appropriate calm of blessed eternity."

just so, Pāṇini has seized and held captive the Sankrit language at a point at which it was well-nigh perfect and conferred fixity on that perfection by reducing the language as he found it to the "calm" of law. Yet Pāṇini's effort terminated in no stasis; Pāṇini had captured Sanskrit at one moment in its growth; he had never arrested it; Pāṇini was in Wordsworth's phrase, both law and impulse; he worked both "to kindle" and "to restrain"; in fact Pāṇini's system was no merely static effort at dissecting the language, but an organism that grew along with the other organism of which it was born, i.e., language. And Kātyāyana and Patañjali, who by preferring to work on Pāṇini's system rather than evolve others of their own, placed the largest offering of praise at his feet, were only instruments used by the growing Sanskrit language to enforce a simultaneous growth in the only system of grammar which had succeeded in reducting it to law.

Sprung from the fountain-head of a superlatively powerful mind and fed by other and equally powerful minds, Pāṇini's system has been a living stream; the confluence of comparative philology has only added to its pace. Pāṇini's work is a deathless record of the fact that ancient Hindus excelled in analytical acumen whenever the tendency to synthesize and philosophize did not lift them beyond the confines of sharp outlines and definable effects. And the scoffers who subsist upon cynicism and who would place Aesop's fables above the sum of Sanskrit literature, creative and critical, can thrive only by ignoring Pāṇini and his peers. Pāṇini is one of the few peaks of ancient Indian cultural effort and sums up in himself the supreme success attained by India in the past, in evolving knowledge out of experience, science out of life, grammar,out of language. Sanskrit which is life and Pāṇini who is its science, are inseparable companions; the one without the other can hardly be thought of. What Pāṇini did for the tongue which found voice for India's

past, can be placed only beside what Bharata did for her Aesthetics, Bādarāyaṇa for her Philosophy and Vālmiki for her Poesy.

पाणिन्यादिमुनित्रयातिगहनग्रन्थेषु सोऽयं मया
नूत्नानूत्नदृशावलोक्य बहुतद्व्याख्या विमर्शः कृतः ।

वस्तुस्थित्युपवर्णनैकनिरतस्तेषां मुदे चेद्भवेत् ,
सोऽयं ये गुणपक्षपातिसुधियो मन्ये कृतार्था कृतिः ॥

शब्दे न्याये तथा वाक्ये वेदान्ते ज्योतिरागमे ।
विमर्शे बहुभाषासु कृतभूरिपरिश्रमः ॥

श्रीपञ्चनदसत्क्षेत्रे गुरुपादाब्जसेवनात् ।
फणिभाषितभाष्याब्धितरणावाप्तपाटवः ॥

काञ्चाङ्गाड्नगरे जातः कृष्णनेत्रावतीसुतः ।
निबन्धं पाणिनीयेऽहं कृतवान् माधवाभिधः ॥

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aitareya Āraṇyaka—Anandasrama Sanskrit Series.

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa—Anandasrama Sanskrtt Series.

Altindische Grammatic—Wackernagel.

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Rescarch Institute.

Aṣṭādhyāyī—Balamanorama Edn.

Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra—Bibliotheca Indica Series.

Atharva Prātiśākhya—Whitney, Journal of American Oriental Society, Vol. 7.

Atharva Veda—Bloomfield.

Atharvavedasaṃhitā—Bombay Edn.

Atharvavedapadānukramaṇikā—Swami, Vishweshvaranand and Nityanand.

Bhāṣyapradīpikā—Adyar Library Transcript, 39. G. 17.

Bhaṭṭikāvya—Calcutta, 1871.

Bṛhaddevatā—Harvard Oriental Series.

Bṛhajjātaka—Venkateshwar Press.

Buddhist India—T. W. Rhys Davids.

Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Adyar Librarry, 2 Vols.

Chāndogya Upaniṣad—Adyar Library Edn.

Chandomañjarī—Calcutta, 1887.

Cāndravyākaraṇa—B. Liebich.

Classified Index to the Sanskrit MSS. in the Palace at Tanjore—Burnell.

Collected works—Sir R. G. Bhandarkar.

Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages—Caldwell.

Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the possession of the Asiatic Soeiety of Bengal—Haraprasada Sastri.

Gaṇaratnamahodadhi—Sarasvati Press, Benares.

Gopatha Brāhmaṇa—Bidliotheca Indica.

Handbuch des Sanskrit—Thumb.

History of Sanskrit Literature—Herbert H. Gowen.

History of Sanskrit Literature—Keith.

History of Sanskrit Literature—Macdonell.

History of Classical Sanskrit Literature—Krishnamachariar.
History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil—P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri—Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.
History of Philosophy—Thilly.
History of Sanskrit Literature—Vaidya.
History of Indian Literature—Winternitz.
Indian Antiquary.
Indian Wisdom—Monier Williams.
Jaimini Sūtra (Pūrvamīmāṃsādarśana)—Bibliotheca Indica.
Journal of Oriental Research—Madras.
Journal of American Oriental Sacicty.
Kāśikāvṛtti—Benaras, 1876.
Kāśmir Śaivaism—J. C. Chatterji.
Kāvyālaṅkāra of Bhāmaha—D. T. Tatacharya.
Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra—Weber.
Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa—Lindner.
Laghuśabdenduśekara—Kāśī Sanskrit Series.
Le Composes Nominaux Dans Le.
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa—Willman Grabouska.
Linguistic Introduction to Sanskrit—Batakrishna Ghosh.
Literary Remains of Goldstucker.
Mahābhāṣya—Kielhorn's Edn.
Malinīvijayottara Tantra—Kashmir Series.
Manusmṛti—Bibliotheca Indica.
Manual of Sanskrit Phonetics—Uhlenbeck.
Memoires de la Societe de Linguistique de Paris.
Nandikeśvara Kārikā—(Mahābhāṣya Edn.) Nirnaya Sagar Press.
Nirukta with Niruktālocana—S. Samasrami.
Padamañjarī—Pandit Series.
Pāli and Sanskrit—Franke.
Pāṇini and his Place in Sanskrit Literature—Goldstucker.
Pāṇini s Grammatik—O. Bohtlingk.
Pāṇini and the Veda—P. Thieme.
Pāṇini—B. Liebech.
Papers on Pāṇini—H. Skold.
Paribhāṣenduśekhara—Bombay Sanskrit Series,
Peep into the Vaidik Age—Ramachandra Ghosa.
Philosophy of Sanskrit Grammar—P. C. Chakravarti.

Pradīpa and Udyota—Nirnayasagar Press.
Praṇavavāda of Gargyayaṇa—The Theosophical Publishing House.
Prakriyākaumudī—Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrt Series.
Prakriyāsarvasva—Adyar Library.
Prauḍhamanoramā—Kāśī Sanskrit Series, 1928.
Ṛgveda—Max Muller.
Ṛgvedapadānukramaṇikā—Swami Vishweshvaranand and Nityanand, Bombay.
Ṛktantra—Suryakanta Shastri.
Ṛk-Prātiśākhya—Benares Sanskrit Series.
Śabdakaustubha—Chowkamba Sanskrit Series.
Śābdikacintāmaṇi—Adyar Library Transcript, 8. K. 3.
Sāmavedasaṃhitā Padānukramaṇikā—Swami Vishweshvaranand and Nityanand, Bombay.
Śānkhāyana Āraṇyaka—Anandsrama Sanskrit Series.
Sanskrit-English Dictionary—Monier Williams.
Sanskrit Grammar—Macdonell.
Sanskrit Grammar for Beginners—Macdonell.
Sanskrit Grammar—Whitney.
Sanskrit Wörterbuch—Bohtlingk and Roth.
Sarasvatīkaṇthābharaṇa—Trivandrum Sanskrit Series.
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa—Bibliotheca India.
Siddhāntakaumudī with Tattvabodhinī—Nirnaya Sagar Press.
Śṛṅgāraprakāśa—Adyar Library Transcript, 39. F. 2.
Svarasiddhāntacandrikā—Annamalai University Sanskrit Series.
Śuklayajurvedapadānukramaṇika—Swami Vishweshvaranand and Nityanand, Bombay.
Studies on Pāṇini's Grammar—Barend Faddegon.
Structure of the Aṣṭādhyāyī—I. S. Pawate.
Systems of Sanskrit Grammar—Belvalkar.
Taittirīya Āraṇyaka—Anandasrama Edn.
Taittirīya Brahmaṇa—Anandasrāma Edn.
Taittirīya Prātiśākhya—Madras University Sanskrit Series.
Taittirīya Saṃhitā—Anandasrama Edn.
Taittirīyasaṃhitāpadānukramaṇikā—Poona.
Tantravārtika of Kumārila—Benares Sanskrit Series.
Translation of the Siddhāntakaumudī—S. C. Vasu.
Tribhāṣyaratna—Mysore Goverment Oriental Library Series.

Uṇādisūtra—Madras University Sanskrit Series.
Vaidikābharaṇa—Mysore Government Oriental Library Series.
Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra—Kāśī Sanskrit Series.
Vaiyākaraṇa Siddhāntalaghumañjūṣā—Chowkhamba Series.
Vājasaneyi—Prātiśākhya—Benares Sanskrit Series.
Vaidikapadānukramakośa—Vishwabandhu Shastri.
Vākyapadīya—Benares Sanskrit Series.
Vedic Grammar—Macdonell.
Word Index to Mahābhāṣya—Pathak and Chitrao.
Word Index to Pāṇinisūtrapāṭha—Pathak and Chitrao.

ABBREVIATIONS

Adh	=	Adhikaraṇa.
Ait	=	Aitareya.
A. P.	=	Atharva Prātiśākhya.
A. S.	=	Akṣarasamāmnāya.
A. S. B.	=	Asiatic Society of Bengal.
Br.	=	Brāhmaṇa.
Ed or edn	=	Edition.
G. O. S	=	Government Oriental Series.
G. O. L.	=	Government Oriental Library.
Gr.	=	Grammar.
Kauṣ.Br.	=	Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa.
K. S. S	=	Kāśī Sanskrit Series.
L. S. S.	=	Laghuśabdendaśekhara.
L. S. Manjūṣā	=	Laghusiddhantamañjūṣā.
M. U. S.	=	Madras University Sanskrit Series.
Mys.	=	Mysore.
N. S.	=	Nirnaya Sagar.
O. R. I	=	Oriental Research Institute.
P	=	Pāṇini.
Pr.	=	Prātiśākhya.
Pr. Man.	=	Prauḍhamanoramā.
R. P.	=	Ṛk—Prātiśākhya.
S. B.	=	Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.
T. B.	=	Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa.
V	=	Vārtika.

4

PĀṆINI KĀTYĀYANA AND PATAÑJALI